


19950103 073

AN ANALYSIS OF THE KC-135
THREE-PERSON COCKPIT

THESIS

Robert A. Deivert, Major, USAF

AFIT/GSO/ENS/94D-6



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
AIR UNIVERSITY

AIR FORCE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio

AFIT/GSO/ENS/94D-6

AN ANALYSIS OF THE KC-135
THREE-PERSON COCKPIT

THESIS

Robert A. Deivert, Major, USAF

AFIT/GSO/ENS/94D-6

Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

DDO QUALITY IMPROVED 3

AN ANALYSIS OF THE KC-135 THREE-PERSON COCKPIT

THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Engineering

of the Air Force Institute of Technology

Air University

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Science (Space Operations)

Robert A. Deivert, B.S.

Major, USAF

December, 1994

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/_____	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	



Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

THESIS APPROVAL

STUDENT: Major Robert A. Deivert, USAF CLASS: GSO-94D

THESES TITLE: AN ANALYSIS OF THE KC-135 3-PERSON COCKPIT

DEFENSE DATE: November 22, 1994

COMMITTEE:	Name/Title/Department	Signature
Advisor	GREGORY S. PARNELL, Col, USAF Head Department of Operational Sciences Graduate School of Engineering	
Reader	JACK M. KLOEBER, Lt Col, ARMY Instructor of Operations Research Department of Operational Sciences Graduate School of Engineering	

Acknowledgements

I must first thank my friends and classmates in the space operations program for all the help and tutoring they provided. Without their help I wouldn't have been able to complete the course work necessary to write this thesis.

My advisor, Colonel Parnell, kept the fires lit under my feet to keep me focused. He made the time to answer my questions and pose new questions for me to answer. He also helped me keep my priorities in life in order.

I owe a lot to some people who took the time from their busy schedules to help me get this project done. Lieutenant Colonel Bruce Billig and Major James Sullivan from Air Mobility Command Headquarters spent hours on the phone with me answering my questions. Captain David Porter from the KC-135 Systems Program Office and Captain John Ehrhart from the Crew Station Evaluation Facility at Wright-Patterson AFB provided me with incredible amounts of data. Major Randy Hutchins from the Combat Crew Training Squadron at Castle AFB was responsible for getting survey results back to me.

The most important person in this endeavor was my wife Sally. She did the job of two parents while I was busy with my studies. I have a lot of lost time to make up with my three girls, Courtney, Amanda and Lindsey. I am sorry for all those times I couldn't share with you. I'm glad to put this behind us and get back our lives together.

Robert A. Deivert

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements.....	ii
List of Figures.....	v
List of Tables.....	vi
Abstract.....	vii
I. Introduction.....	1-1
1.1 Problem Statement.....	1-1
1.2 Background	1-1
1.3 Research Scope and Objectives	1-3
1.4 Overview of Thesis	1-4
II. Utility Function.....	2-1
2.1 Methodology	2-1
2.1.1 Value.....	2-2
2.1.2 Objectives.....	2-2
2.1.3 Attributes	2-4
2.1.4 Survey.....	2-5
2.1.5 Value Model.....	2-5
III. Cost Analysis.....	3-1
3.1 Navigator Costs	3-1
3.1.1 Training Costs	3-2
3.1.2 Manpower Costs	3-2
3.2 Equipment Costs.....	3-3
3.3 Break-even Analysis.....	3-4
3.4 Present Value.....	3-5

	Page
IV. Sensitivity Analysis.....	4-1
4.1 Value Model Sensitivity	4-1
4.2 Analysis of Break-even Point.....	4-4
4.3 Analysis of the Net Present Value.....	4-6
4.4 Increasing Utility of Value Model.....	4-7
4.5 Break-even Analysis with Additional Equipment.....	4-8
4.5 NPV Calculations With Additional Equipment.....	4-10
V. Conclusions and Recommendations.....	5-1
5.1 Conclusions	5-1
5.2 Recommendations.....	5-2
Appendix A. Value Model.....	A-1
A.1 Descriptions of the Attributes.....	A-1
A.2 Survey.....	A-5
A.3 Scored Value Model.....	A-10
Appendix B. Costs.....	B-1
B.1 Navigator Costs.....	B-1
B.2 Equipment Costs.....	B-2
B.3 Break-even and Net Present Value Calculations.....	B-3
Appendix C. Value Model With Additional Equipment.....	C-1
C.1 Increased Utility With Upgraded Equipment, GCAS and TCAS.....	C-1
Bibliography.....	BIB-1
Vita.....	V-1

List of Figures

Figure	Page
2.1 Value Hierarchy with 2 of the 4 Branches Expanded.....	2-1
2.2 Value Model Results.....	2-7
3.1 Break-even Curve.....	3-4
3.2 Break-even Curve with Guard and Reserve Manpower Reductions.....	3-5
4.1 DPL Influence Diagram Used for Sensitivity Analysis.....	4-2
4.2 Tornado Diagram Shows Sensitivity to Weights.....	4-3
4.3 Sensitivity to Equipment Costs.....	4-4
4.4 Sensitivity to Inflation Rate.....	4-5
4.5 Sensitivity to Discount Rate.....	4-7
4.6 Break-even Curve With Added Equipment.....	4-9
4.7 Utility Versus NPV.....	4-11
4.8 Mission Accomplishment Versus Safety of Flight.....	4-12

List of Tables

Table		Page
2.1	Phases of Flight.....	2-3
3.1	Navigator Training Costs.....	3-2
3.2	Equipment Cash Flow.....	3-3
4.1	Cash Flows for GCAS and TCAS in Constant 1995 Millions of Dollars.....	4-9
4.2	Summary of NPV With the Addition of GCAS and TCAS.....	4-10

Abstract

In an effort to quantitatively determine the utility of mission effectiveness of the KC-135, this research used value-focused thinking to measure the impact of replacing the KC-135 navigator with upgraded avionics. A Value Model was developed as a hierarchy with fundamental objectives at the highest level and attributes at the lowest level. Weights were assigned to show the contribution each level had to the one above it. The attributes were given a score and an additive model was used to determine utility with and without a navigator. Break-even analysis and net present value calculations were done to show the costs associated with each alternative. This study reveals that the cockpit with the navigator has a higher utility than the cockpit with the upgraded avionics. Value-focused thinking identified additional equipment that would increase the utility of the upgraded avionics. This approach can be used to identify equipment alternatives in the future that add the most utility. This methodology can be used by the Air National Guard to determine whether they should keep navigators as part of the KC-135 crew.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE KC-135 THREE-PERSON COCKPIT

I. Introduction

1.1 Problem Statement

The NAVSTAR Global Positioning System (GPS) proved invaluable to the warfighter during Desert Storm. (10:242) All military aircraft will eventually acquire GPS receivers in their cockpit and have precise position information available at all times. (25) In these times of tight federal budgets and shrinking manpower authorizations, can the cost of GPS and other high technology avionics be offset by replacing any manpower positions. Specifically, can the KC-135 operate as effectively and with lower life-cycle costs if the navigator position is replaced with upgraded avionics?

1.2 Background

The KC-135 is currently planned to remain in the Air Force inventory through at least the year 2020. (17) A large percentage of the cockpit avionics of the KC-135 rely on 1950s and 1960s technology. This outdated technology has degraded the reliability, maintainability, and safety of the airplane. The Strategic Air Command (SAC) recognized this fact and issued a Statement of Need in 1987 to upgrade the KC-135 cockpit avionics. (7:3) Air Mobility Command (AMC) issued a Mission Need Statement in 1994 to continue the cockpit modernization. (15) A plan was developed to integrate upgraded avionics into the airplane through a series of modification blocks. This was a unique plan in that it shifted from a philosophy of reacting to urgent deficiencies to a long-range systematic modernization. Each step in the plan will integrate follow-on upgrades and

maintain commonality with other Air force weapon systems. (3:1) "Current technology allows the KC-135 to be updated with avionics that have significantly higher levels of reliability and maintainability, thereby reducing life-cycle costs and increasing mission reliability."(19:1) The cockpit displays will be more automated, allow for better aircrew interface, provide enhanced navigation through the integration of GPS, and should reduce crew workload. (7:3) With the decrease in crew workload, SAC and later AMC, tasked the Crew Station Evaluation Facility (CSEF) at Wright-Patterson AFB to determine if a three-person crew without a navigator would be feasible. The CSEF does human engineering evaluations to support the System Programs Offices (SPOs). (26:1)

KC-135 crew reduction has been addressed several times over the past 20 years. A dual inertial navigation system (INS) was installed and tested in 1976. These tests determined the crew workload was prohibitively high with a three-man crew and recommended retaining the four-man crew. (26:1) A study done in 1981 completely revamped the cockpit equipment and displays with state of the art hardware and electronic multipurpose displays. The crew duties were also reallocated to evenly distribute the workloads. This simulation study concluded that the KC-135 mission could be done with a three-man crew only if the present cockpit avionics were updated and relocated. (26:1) Lessons learned during the Persian Gulf War renewed debate over the three-man cockpit question. Do the demands of combat missions with multiple mission changes, complex timing, area saturation and degraded navigation aids justify keeping the navigator as part of the KC-135 crew? (7:1)

The CSEF upgraded a simulator cockpit with advanced avionics and flew test missions with three- and four-man cockpits to study this question. The CSEF study centered on workloads in the cockpit. It found workloads increased for the three-man cockpit during inflight replanning, random refueling, navigation, and radar. (7:25) Further results revealed that workloads were always less for four-man crews (7:18) and that there

was a statistically significant difference in workloads between the three-man and four-man configurations. (7:23) The CSEF concluded that it is feasible, provided that the necessary cockpit avionics modifications are made, to fly the KC-135 without a navigator as part of the crew. These modifications are contingent upon the use of leading edge technologies and the automation of tasks. (7:25) Another conclusion was that introducing new technology in the form of upgraded avionics will increase the mission efficiency of the KC-135. (7:1) However, there was no objective, quantitative measure of mission efficiency.

1.3 Research Scope and Objectives

The primary focus of this research effort is to analyze the benefits of replacing the navigator with upgraded avionics from a life-cycle cost and effectiveness viewpoint. The life-cycle costs of the upgraded avionics will be compared to the manpower cost of the KC-135 navigators. Every function that the navigator provides during each phase of the mission will be identified and assigned a utility. This functional list will be compared to the capabilities provided by the upgraded avionics to ensure that the system retains at least its current effectiveness.

This research will analyze life-cycle costs of the equipment identified in the CSEF three-man cockpit feasibility study. This equipment falls into three categories: equipment the KC-135 must have, equipment that it should have, and equipment that would be nice to have. (7:26) This paper will try to limit its analysis to the life-cycle costs of the must have equipment, but any equipment that substantially adds to the effectiveness of the KC-135 will be included. Some specific types of equipment have been identified and costed. (18) When available, costs for this equipment will be used. Where an explicit piece has

yet to be identified, a cost estimate from the SPO or the Oklahoma City Air Logistics Center will be used.

Decision analysis techniques will be applied to provide weighted effectiveness measures for each navigator function. Functions will be grouped by the phase of the mission to which they apply. The contribution of each mission phase to safety of flight and mission accomplishment will be determined. The analysis will assess the net gain or loss in effectiveness of the cockpit with the upgraded equipment and no navigator compared to the cockpit with a navigator and no upgraded equipment.

1.4 Overview of Thesis

Chapter II develops a Value Model to quantitatively evaluate the mission effectiveness of the KC-135. This model will be used to compare the utility of mission effectiveness of the KC-135 with the navigator as part of the crew to one with upgraded avionics and no navigator. This will determine the change in mission effectiveness as manpower is reduced.

Chapter III compares the life-cycle equipment costs with the navigator manpower costs. Break-even analysis will show the payback period for the new equipment.

Chapter IV analyzes the results of the cost study and effectiveness analysis. Sensitivity analysis will show how the break-even point changes as additional equipment is added and what factors can change the utility.

Finally, Chapter V summarizes the analysis, reports significant findings and draws conclusions. Recommendations to increase safety of flight and mission accomplishment are made.

II. Utility Function

This chapter explains the methodology used to develop a Value Model to evaluate the mission effectiveness of the KC-135, currently equipped with the navigator as part of the crew. This model will then be used to determine the mission effectiveness of the KC-135 with upgraded avionics and no navigator.

2.1 Methodology

The technique chosen to quantitatively evaluate the mission effectiveness is Value-Focused Thinking. This method focuses on values being the driving force for decisionmaking instead of choices among available alternatives. (13:3) The method was similar to that used by Air University to evaluate space systems for the *Spacecast 2020* report. (21:S-4) The Value Model is a hierarchy with broad fundamental objectives that define our value at the top level, means objectives that are means to achieve fundamental objectives at the next level, and attributes that define a given objective's qualities more precisely at the lowest level. (13:203) Figure 2.1 shows this hierarchy.

VALUE							
FUNDAMENTAL OBJECTIVE (WEIGHT)				FUNDAMENTAL OBJECTIVE (WEIGHT)			
MEANS OBJECTIVE (WEIGHT)			MEANS OBJECTIVE (WEIGHT)	MEANS OBJECTIVE (WEIGHT)			MEANS OBJECTIVE (WEIGHT)
ATTRIBUTE (WEIGHT)	ATTRIBUTE (WEIGHT)	ATTRIBUTE (WEIGHT)		ATTRIBUTE (WEIGHT)	ATTRIBUTE (WEIGHT)	ATTRIBUTE (WEIGHT)	
SCORE	SCORE	SCORE		SCORE	SCORE	SCORE	

Figure 2.1 Value Hierarchy with 2 of the 4 Branches Expanded

The value model was developed to objectively and quantitatively go from the lowest level of the hierarchy to an overall utility for mission effectiveness. The attributes were assigned scores which were multiplied by the relative weights for each attribute. These weights define the contribution the attributes make to their means objectives or mission phases. These products were then summed over each mission phase. This total was multiplied by the weight given to each mission phase and summed over all the mission phases. This total was multiplied by the weight given to each fundamental objective and summed over the fundamental objectives. This is summarized by the following equation:

$$U(x) = \sum_{f=1}^F W_f \sum_{m=1}^M W_m \sum_{a=1}^A W_a S_a(x)$$

f = fundament objectives

m = means objectives

a = attributes.

A more detailed explanation of the Value Model continues below.

2.1.1 Value

The value that we will examine is increasing mission effectiveness. The value of overall mission effectiveness is difficult to define. The meaning of a value can be articulated qualitatively by stating objectives. (13:7)

2.1.2 Objectives

According to Keeney, the first step in setting objectives is to define what an objective is and decide who should set them. Objectives are something one desires to

achieve. They are characterized by three features: a decision context, an object, and a direction of preference. (13:34) Objectives should come from individuals interested in and knowledgeable about that situation. (13:56)

I used my own experience as a KC-135 Combat Crew Training Squadron (CCTS) instructor pilot to determine two objectives to help explicitly define the value of mission effectiveness. I validated these choices with other KC-135 CCTS instructors, Air Force Safety Agency (AFSA) personnel and the 380th Air Refueling Wing (ARW) commander. The fundamental objectives were to maximize safety of flight and to maximize mission accomplishment. The objectives possess the characteristics listed above. The contexts of these objectives are safety of flight and mission accomplishment. The objects are to maximize safety of flight and mission accomplishment. In both objectives the direction of preference is more is better. These fundamental objectives must be compatible with the decision context. In this case, they are nearly the same as the decision context. (13:36) These objectives however, are still too vague to be able to objectively quantify.

The objectives hierarchy must be expanded and more fully articulated. Means objectives or detail objectives (5:434) must be identified that add more specification to the fundamental objectives. The logical breakdown of an overall mission is into mission phases. The CSEF developed a list of twenty mission events. (26:5) This list of events was combined and simplified into the seven phases of flight shown in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 Phases of Flight

1. MISSION PLANNING
2. SQUADRON/BASE OPERATIONS
3. PREFLIGHT
4. TAKEOFF & DEPARTURE
5. AIR REFUELING
6. CRUISE
7. DESCENT & APPROACH

Next, attributes need to be identified that indicate the extent to which the objectives are achieved. (12:64)

2.1.3 Attributes

Attributes are operational measures that correspond to an objective and quantify the extent that an objective is accomplished. (5:431) Attributes should be complete, so they cover all the important aspects of the problem; operational, so they can be used meaningfully; nonredundant, so that double counting of impacts can be avoided; minimal, so the problem dimension can be kept as small as possible; (12:50) and measurable, so that appropriate value judgments can be made. (13:112)

The functions a KC-135 navigator performs during each phase of flight are the basis for attributes to measure mission effectiveness. The CSEF analyzed the KC-135 mission and listed the navigator's tasks. (26:38-55) This list served as the basis from which attributes were created that had the desired properties listed above.

For many of the attributes there was no commonly understood index to objectively measure levels. In these cases where there was no natural attribute, a constructed or subjective index had to be defined. (13:101) A zero level of utility was defined along with an optimum level which was given the value of one. All attributes were assumed to be linear on this scale with a score between zero and one. Appendix A.1 contains all attributes along with their definitions of zero and optimum utility. From this bottom level of the hierarchy we need weights that relate each level's contribution to the level above it.

2.1.4 Survey

A survey was used to determine the relative contribution that each level of the hierarchy had on the level above it. The survey is included in Appendix A. Twenty-five questionnaires were sent out to KC-135 instructor pilots and navigators. Seventeen were returned. Sixteen respondents were members of the 93 Air Refueling Squadron, the KC-135 CCTS, at Castle AFB CA. All members of the squadron are highly experienced instructors in the KC-135. The final response came from a KC-135 wing commander.

The results from each survey question were averaged and scaled between zero and one. These values were used as the weights for each level of the value hierarchy. The results are expressed in the Value Model matrix in Appendix A.3.

2.1.5 Value Model

Before the Value Model could provide useful data, the model had to be simplified and scores had to be assigned to each attribute. The first step in this process was to combine some attributes that were redundant. The attributes fell into two categories. The first group were functions that could be automated with equipment. The second group

were functions that could not be automated and had to be accomplished manually. Scores were assigned to all attributes according to the attribute description in Appendix A.1.

The first alternative to be scored was the case with a navigator as part of the crew. Scores were assigned for both the automated and manual attributes. The next alternative scored was the one with the upgraded avionics and no navigator. Scores were given to the automated attributes based on a systems descriptions contained in the CSEF's KC-135 Cockpit Design Study. (3) The manual functions still had to be accomplished by a crew of three instead of a crew of four. Each of these functions was then assigned three-quarters of the score given to the four-man crew. With all the weights and scores assigned, we move on to the choice of a utility function.

The utility function can be expressed as a composition of the two individual utility functions if mutual utility independence exists. (5:480) This multilinear function has the general form:

$$U(s,m) = k_s U_s(s) + k_m U_m(m) + (1 - k_s - k_m) U_s(s) U_m(m)$$

k_s = the weight given safety of flight

k_m = the weight given mission accomplishment.

Mutual utility independence holds if the certainty equivalent amount for the safety of flight objective remains the same no matter what the level of the mission accomplishment objective and the certainty equivalent amount for the mission accomplishment objective remains the same no matter what the level of the safety of flight objective. (5:478) This condition holds based on a certainty equivalent lottery with a KC-135 wing commander. Hence, mutual utility independence exists. Since $k_s + k_m = 1$, then the utility function is additive and has the form:

$$U(s,m) = k_s U_s(s) + k_m U_m(m). \quad (5:481)$$

All of the scores and weights were run in this model for the case where the navigator is part of the crew. The model was then run again for the case where equipment has replaced the navigator. Figure 2.2 depicts the results.




Figure 2.2 Value Model Results

With the upgraded equipment, the KC-135 has a 4% higher mission effectiveness with the navigator as part of the crew. The results of the sensitivity analysis will determine which objective changed to lower the mission effectiveness with upgraded avionics.

III. Cost Analysis

Break-even analysis will determine if and when replacing manpower with upgraded avionics will save money over the life-cycle of the KC-135. (8:199) The yearly training costs and salaries for active duty navigators will be compared with the costs of new equipment and reduced manpower. Presently, the Air National Guard has no plans to reduce manpower. (22) Current plans are for the KC-135 to remain in the inventory until at least the year 2020. (17) Yearly cash flows will be computed and a break-even curve will be constructed. Net present value calculations will be done to compare the overall life-cycle costs. All cash flows will be brought back to 1995, the first year of the upgraded avionics contracts. Operating costs for the new equipment will be assumed equal to the current equipment and so will not be considered in this analysis. This study also assumes that there are no manpower shortages at the beginning of the study period.

3.1 Navigator Costs

The costs for navigators depend on the number of aircraft and the crew ratio per aircraft. The total number of KC-135 aircraft assigned to the active duty forces is 187. There are 1.36 navigators assigned per aircraft for a total of 254 navigators. (23) This number will be kept constant for all calculations through 2020. Historically, sixty-four navigators will have to be trained each year for the tanker in order to maintain the crew ratio. (23) Training costs for new navigators and salaries for the existing navigators make-up the total manpower costs.

3.1.1 Training Costs

The training costs for KC-135 navigators include the following: commissioning costs, Officer Training School (OTS) (11), Air Force Reserve Officer Training Course (AFROTC) (11), or the United States Air Force Academy (USAFA) (20); Specialized Undergraduate Navigator Training (SUNT) (16); and Initial Qualification Training (IQT) (16). Table 3.1 summarizes the 1994 training costs for KC-135 navigators.

Table 3.1 Navigator Training Costs

Commissioning Source	Cost per Navigator	Number
OTS	17,510	655
AFROTC	42,996	1,731
USAFA	172,852	1,008
weighted average	76,644	
SUNT	118,118	64
Qualification Training	124,437	64
TOTAL	319,199	64

Appendix B.1 shows the cash flows associated with training 64 navigators for each year from 1995 through 2020. Each year is inflated at the rate projected by the Congressional Budget Office. (24:36)

3.1.2 Manpower Costs

Manpower costs were computed based on paying 254 navigators at an average rank of captain. Salaries are composite and include salary plus contributions toward retirement. The composite rate for 1995 was listed as \$71,554. (1:Table A19-1) This rate

was inflated at the same rate as training costs. Yearly cash flows for manpower were figured and are listed in Appendix B.1.

The yearly cash flows for training and manpower were added to show the total expenditure for navigators.

3.2 Equipment Costs

Current plans call for the upgraded avionics to be provided under three contracts: Radar, Global Positioning System (GPS), and Compass. The total cost to upgrade approximately 600 aircraft in constant 1995 dollars is \$432 million. (18) Table 3.2 shows the cash flows in \$millions in constant 1995 dollars for the upgraded equipment.

Table 3.2 Equipment Cash Flow

YEAR	CONTRACT		
	Compass	Radar	GPS
1995	13.1	5.4	22.8
1996	17.5	21.6	24.5
1997	23.3	32.3	35.5
1998	21.6	30.1	34.6
1999	19.2	26.6	30.3
2000	15.9	21.5	25.3
2001	2.8	3.9	4.5
Totals	113.4	141.4	177.5

Actual installation of the equipment will begin in 1997. At that time the number of navigators will start to be reduced. One-fifth of the force will be reduced each year until the number drops to forty-two. This small number of navigators will be retained to plan and fly complex missions. (23) Ten navigators will be trained every year. Composite salaries will also have to be paid to forty-two navigators.

The total costs for the upgraded equipment will include the equipment itself plus training and manpower costs for a reduced number of navigators. Appendix B.2 details the cash flows every year for this option. Again, all costs have been inflated over time.

3.3 Break-even Analysis

A break-even analysis will show when the savings from reduced manpower will equal the cost of the new equipment. The yearly cash flows in constant 1995 dollars were inflated and then added to get cumulative cash flows for navigators versus upgraded equipment.




Figure 3.1 Break-even Curve

Figure 3.1 shows that approximately six years after the upgraded equipment is completely installed, the money saved from active duty manpower reductions will pay for the upgraded equipment. Money will be saved over the next thirteen years of the fleet's planned lifetime.




Figure 3.2 Break-even Curve with Guard and Reserve Manpower Reductions

Figure 3.2 shows the break-even point is a year and a half earlier if the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve were to eliminate their KC-135 navigators. This curve is based on the Air National Guard having 259 navigators and the Air Force Reserve having 72 navigators. These numbers are based on a 1.27 crew ratio. The manpower reductions would begin in the year 2000 when the Guard and Reserve start to receive upgraded avionics. Twenty percent of the navigators would be removed every year until the Guard drops to 43 navigators and the Reserve drops to 12 navigators.

3.4 Present Value

Another way to look at the money saved is from a net present value calculation. This technique allows us to collapse the stream of cash flows for the two alternatives into a single number for each alternative. Present value takes into account the time value of

money and gives us a single value in present dollars. (8:23) Appendix B.3 shows the net present value calculations with an interest rate of 5.8 percent (1:Financial Management Analysis Bulletin Board) used to discount the yearly cash flows back to 1995, the first year of the equipment contracts. This calculation shows that the net present value of the upgraded equipment is over \$179 million or approximately 24% less than the net present value of keeping 1.36 navigators per aircraft.

IV. Sensitivity Analysis

The two previous chapters have determined a base value for the utility of mission effectiveness, identified the break-even point and calculated net present value. This chapter will analyze those results. Sensitivity analysis will be done to determine if any of the weights assigned to the objectives of the Value Model change the result that the cockpit with the navigator has the higher utility. The break-even point will be analyzed to determine the affect of uncertain equipment costs and varying inflation rates. The net present values of manpower costs and equipment costs will be examined with changing discount rates.

In addition to analyzing the Value Model, suggestions will be made for additional equipment that will increase the utility of the KC-135 mission effectiveness. Once the utility is shown to increase with additional equipment, the break-even point and net present value will be calculated for the added equipment.

4.1 Value Model Sensitivity

The main concern of respondents to the value survey was that the weight they assigned to safety of flight and mission accomplishment would vary based on mission importance. In peacetime, more weight would be given to safety. During war, more weight would be given to mission accomplishment. Sensitivity analysis to the weights assigned by the survey would determine if their concerns were valid.

DPL (6:334) was used to identify the critical weights that would change the recommended policy of the Value Model. The influence diagram depicted in Figure 4.1 was used for sensitivity analysis.




Figure 4.1 DPL Influence Diagram Used for Sensitivity Analysis

The tornado diagram in Figure 4.2 shows the results of this analysis. The only weights that did alter the recommended alternative were the weights assigned to the fundamental objectives of safety of flight (**safety_wt**) and mission planning under the fundamental objective safety of flight (**s_mp_wt**). A safety of flight weight less than




Figure 4.2 Tornado Diagram Shows Sensitivity to Weights

23.3% caused the utility of the upgraded equipment to exceed the utility of the navigator. None of the survey responses were less than this value. Any mission planning weight greater than 41.5% caused the utility of the upgraded equipment to exceed the utility of the navigator. Only 2 survey responses out of 17 or approximately 12% exceeded this value.

4.2 Analysis of Break-even Point

The break-even point was calculated with the assumption that all the costs and rates of inflation are known with certainty. We can examine the impact of cost overruns and varying inflation rates.

Figure 4.3 shows the sensitivity of the break-even point to a 10% and a 25% cost overrun on equipment. This graph shows that the break-even point is one year later with a 10% cost increase and is a little more than two years later with a 25% cost increase.




Figure 4.3 Sensitivity to Equipment Costs

Figure 4.4 displays the impact of a changing inflation rate on the break-even point.





Figure 4.4 Sensitivity to Inflation Rate

The manpower costs include training costs and salaries. Equipment costs include those same training costs and salaries for a reduced number of navigators as well as the equipment itself. The inflation rate was varied plus and minus two percent from the base rate of three percent. The graphs show that reducing the inflation rate moves the break-even point one year later. Increasing the inflation rate, moves the break-even point one year earlier. This happens because the inflation rate has a greater affect on the manpower costs which occur during the entire life-cycle.

4.3 Analysis of the Net Present Value

The discount rate or the minimum attractive rate of return (8.78) used to compute the net present value was varied from the base inflation rate of three percent to the historical rate of ten percent. (1) This analysis in Figure 4.5 shows that the change in NPV for equipment is much less than the change in NPV for manpower. Manpower costs continue to increase every year over the life-cycle, while the equipment costs occur only during the first seven years of the life-cycle. These manpower costs in the later years of the life-cycle are heavily discounted.




Figure 4.5 Sensitivity to Discount Rate

4.4 Increasing Utility of Value Model

In order to increase the utility with upgraded equipment, we must return to the Value Model. Once the weights for the objectives and attributes are assigned, the only way to increase utility is to add equipment that increases the scores of the attributes. The largest increase in utility will occur with the addition of equipment that has the largest affect on many attributes across multiple mission phases. Two pieces of additional equipment were found that met this criterion. The first is a Ground Collision Avoidance System (GCAS). The second is a Terminal Collision Avoidance System (TCAS).

Discussions with the air logistics center item manager provided insight into the capabilities of GCAS. (9) Along with providing audio and visual warnings for ground collision, the system could also warn of improper gear or flap configuration and windshear. Attribute numbers 21, 24, 45, 48, and 53 from Appendix C.1 had significantly higher scores with the addition of GCAS. The utility increased from 0.512 to 0.555, an increase of approximately 8%.

Interviews with Headquarters AMC personnel helped to determine the potential benefits of TCAS. (4) The primary purpose of TCAS is to provide warning against collisions with other aircraft. An additional capability being considered is the ability to monitor position within a formation. Attribute numbers 18, 23, 30, 34, and 49 from Appendix C.1 had higher scores with TCAS installed. The utility increased from 0.512 to 0.558, an increase of approximately 8%.

Appendix C.1 shows the spreadsheet with upgraded avionics plus GCAS and TCAS. The overall utility improved to 0.601, an improvement of approximately 15%. The impact on the break-even point must be considered.


4.5 Break-even Analysis with Additional Equipment

Cash flows for GCAS and TCAS had to be determined before break-even analysis could be done. Budgeted numbers were obtained directly from the Oklahoma Air Logistics Center (ALC) for GCAS. (9) Estimates for TCAS were obtained from the KC-135 SPO (17) and the ALC (2). These estimates ranged from \$71 million to \$100 million.

The mean value of a uniform distribution between 71 million and 100 million was used for the TCAS cost estimate. An assumption was made that it would take three years to get money for TCAS into the budget. (4) Money would be in the budget for TCAS starting in 1998 and would be spent over eight years as shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Cash Flows for GCAS and TCAS in Constant 1995 Millions of Dollars

YEAR	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	TOTALS
GCAS	12.2	6.7	9.9	9.6	9.0	4.4	3.0	2.5	2.0	0.0	0.0	59.3
TCAS	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.6	12.8	17.1	17.1	12.8	8.5	4.3	4.3	85.5



The graph in Figure 4.6 shows the result on the break-even point as additional equipment is added individually and together. GCAS adds a little more than a year to the break-even point. TCAS adds approximately two years. If both pieces are added the break-even point moves three years to 2010. Money will be saved over at least the next ten years of the planned life-cycle of the KC-135.

4.5 NPV Calculations With Additional Equipment

NPV calculations can be done by discounting the cash flows from the break-even analysis. Table 4.2 summarizes these results in \$millions as well as the marginal NPV and annual equivalent amount. The marginal NPV is the difference between the NPV of the additional equipment and the basic upgraded avionics package. The annual equivalent amount expresses the NPV as a series of equal payments that would have to be made yearly with an interest rate of 5.8% over the life-cycle of the KC-135. (8:44)

Table 4.2 Summary of NPV With the Addition of GCAS and TCAS

	NPV	MARGINAL NPV	ANNUAL EQUIVALENT
EQUIPMENT	\$577		\$44
GCAS	\$632	\$55	\$48
TCAS	\$650	\$73	\$50
TCAS & GCAS	\$693	\$116	\$53




Figure 4.7 Utility Versus NPV

Figure 4.7 shows a plot of utility versus NPV for the different equipment options. This graph reveals that no single option dominates the others. As equipment is added to increase utility, the cost measured in NPV also increases.

Figure 4.8 shows how the different equipment options affect the fundamental objectives. The upgraded avionics which replace the navigator add mission accomplishment (2%) at the expense of some safety of flight (-7%). The addition of either GCAS or TCAS add both mission accomplishment and safety of flight. Both GCAS and TCAS have more safety of flight and mission accomplishment than the cockpit with the navigator. TCAS adds more to mission accomplishment; GCAS adds more to safety of flight. The addition of GCAS and TCAS together add significantly to both mission accomplishment (12%) and safety of flight (10%).




Figure 4.8 Mission Accomplishment Versus Safety of Flight

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter examines conclusions reached from the Value Model and cost analysis. It recommends using value-focused thinking by the Air National Guard to determine their manpower needs and proposes additional equipment to improve the mission effectiveness of the KC-135.

5.1 Conclusions

The primary focus of this research was to determine the impact on mission effectiveness and life-cycle costs of replacing the KC-135 navigator with upgraded avionics. The study emphasizes the use of value-focused thinking to objectively measure mission effectiveness and identify additional equipment that will increase mission effectiveness. The break-even point was used to measure the impact on life-cycle costs.

The cockpit with the navigator had a higher mission effectiveness than the cockpit with upgraded avionics when the upgraded equipment included GPS, new radar and compass. The break-even point in this case was 2007, 12 years after the initial year of the equipment contracts and 6 years after installation was complete. Sensitivity analysis showed that the results of the Value Model were changed only by the weight given to the safety of flight objective and mission planning under the objective of safety of flight. The break-even point was not significantly changed by varying the inflation rate or equipment costs.

By using value-focused thinking, GCAS and TCAS were identified as equipment that added the most value. This was due to their contributions to utility across many phases of flight. When either was added to the Value Model, the mission effectiveness utility increased by approximately 8%. The addition of both GCAS and TCAS increased

utility by nearly 15%. The break-even point was a little more than a year later with the addition of GCAS. The purchase of TCAS added about two years to the break-even point. GCAS and TCAS together moved the break-even point three years later. Money will be saved over the last ten years of the planned life-cycle if both pieces of equipment are bought.

5.2 Recommendations

The Air National Guard has some reservations about replacing manpower with upgraded avionics. (22) The Air National Guard's main concern is wartime missions with much complexity and many airplanes in a small airspace. They believe their crews may become task saturated. Although all the navigator functions have been reallocated, at times multiple functions must be performed simultaneously. Value-focused thinking could be used to develop a Value Model, similar to the one used in this research, that would enable them to quantitatively evaluate the utility their navigators provide. They could determine their own objectives and attributes and assess their value from their perspective. This would allow them to identify missions or phases of missions where task saturation occurs. A determination could then be made whether additional training, additional equipment or retaining navigators is the solution to task saturation.

The active duty Air Force is keeping a small number of navigators to fly complex missions to relieve task saturation. Mission activities must be identified where the use of additional manpower is beneficial or necessary. With modern avionics this additional manpower does not have to be a navigator. He could be another pilot, a boom operator, or even a flight engineer. The use of a boom operator or flight engineer would save in training costs and composite salaries.

The choice of GCAS and TCAS was from available technology. If this constraint were removed, additional equipment could be designed to further increase mission effectiveness. Equipment that is used during many mission phases would provide the most effectiveness. A mission database could be available for both planning and inflight use. This would incorporate a terrain map, all instrument approaches and departures from current Flight Information Publications, and all enroute charts. A color chart would be automatically drawn and a flight plan produced once mission parameters were entered. It could plan and display alternate missions if the primary mission changed. It could display terrain on the electronic horizontal situation indicator and tie into the GCAS to provide additional ground collision warning. It could also tie in with differential GPS to provide approach monitoring and display. This system could make paper in the cockpit unnecessary.

Another future system would be an intelligent monitor and warning system. This system could monitor all aircraft systems. If a malfunction occurred, the system would inform you of the problem and computerized checklists for that malfunction would come up automatically. Another feature would monitor flight parameters. You could set an altitude, heading, and airspeed and deviations would be automatically announced. It would know where you are in flight and determine when the gear, flaps, and fuel panel are set incorrectly.

Equipment such as these systems may not be cost effective for the current KC-135, but by using a value-focused approach, future systems can be envisioned that will provide increased mission effectiveness for the future.

This research assumed that operating costs for upgraded equipment would equal operating costs for the old equipment. The failure rates for the new equipment should actually be much lower than the old equipment. (4) Further research could determine the operating costs of the new equipment evaluate the affect on the break-even point.

Bibliography

1. Air Force Instruction 65-503. *US Air Force Cost and Planning Factors*. 4 Feb 94.
2. Barbie, Sarah. Telephone Interview. Oklahoma Air Logistics Center/LAC, Tinker AFB OK, 20 Oct 94.
3. Barnaba, James M., et al.. *Function Analysis and Function Reallocation. KC-135 Crew Reduction Feasibility Demonstration Simulation Study, Volume 2: Cockpit Design*. Crew Station Evaluation Facility, Human Factors Branch, ASD/ENECH, Wright-Patterson AFB OH, March 1992. (ASD-TR-92-5003)
4. Billig, Lt Col Bruce. Telephone Interview. Headquarters Air Mobility Command/XPQA, Scott AFB IL, 12 Oct 94.
5. Clemen, Robert T., *Making Hard Decisions: An Introduction to Decision Analysis*. Boston: PWS-Kent Company, 1991.
6. *DPL (Version 3.1)*. Menlo Park, CA: ADA Decision Systems, 1992.
7. Ehrhart, Capt John E., Jr., et al. *KC-135 Cockpit Modernization Study and Crew Reduction Feasibility Demonstration*. Crew Station Evaluation Facility, Crew Systems Branch, ASC/ENSC, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH, March 1992. (ASC-TR-93-5023)
8. Fabrycky, Wolter J. and Benjamin S. Blanchard. *Life-Cycle Cost and Economic Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1991.
9. Gill, Dane. Telephone Interview. Oklahoma Air Logistics Center/LACMM, Tinker AFB OK, 19 Oct 94.
10. Hallion, Richard P. *Storm Over Iraq: Air Power and the Gulf War*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1992.
11. Hutchins, Richard. Telephone Interview. Headquarters Air Education and Training Command/FMAT, Randolph AFB TX, 8 Sep 1994.

12. Keeney, Ralph L. and Howard Raiffa. *Decisions with Multiple Objectives: Preference and Value Tradeoffs*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1976.
13. Keeney, Ralph L. *Value-Focused Thinking: A Path to Creative Decisionmaking*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1992.
14. Larson, Wiley J. and James R. Wertz, ed. *Space Mission Analysis and Design* (Second Edition). Torrance, CA: Microcosm, Inc., 1992.
15. *Mission Need Statement for Improved Cockpit for the KC-135*. 7 April 1994. (AMC MNS 018-93)
16. Parsons, Mark. Telephone Interview. Headquarters Air Education and Training Command/FMAF, Randolph AFB TX, 8 Sep 1994.
17. Porter, Capt David. Personal Interview. KC-135 Systems Program Office, Wright-Patterson AFB OH, 19 May 1994.
18. Puckett, Chris. Telephone Interview. Oklahoma City Air Logistics Center/LACMC, Tinker AFB OK, 29 Aug 1994.
19. Rueb, Maj Justin D., et al. *KC-135 Crew Reduction Feasibility Demonstration Simulation Study, Volume 3: Test and Evaluation*. Crew Station Evaluation Facility, Human Factors Branch, ASD/ENECH, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH, March 1992. (ASD-TR-92-5004)
20. Sagert, Pamela. Telephone Interview. United States Air Force Academy/FMA, United States Air Force Academy CO, 9 Sep 1994.
21. *Spacecast 2020, Volume I*. Air University, Air Education and Training Command, Maxwell Air Force Base, AL, June 1994.
22. Stiers, Major Michael. Telephone Interview. National Guard Bureau/XOOM, The Pentagon, 17 Oct 1994.
23. Sullivan, Major James. Telephone Interview. Headquarters Air Mobility Command/DOTF, Scott AFB IL, 12 Oct 1994.

24. "The USAF in Facts & Figures," *Air Force Magazine*, May 1994, 36.
25. U. S. Congress, House of Representatives. *National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994*, Conference Report to accompany H.R. 2401, Sec. 152. 103d Congress, 1st Session 103-357.
26. Ward, Capt G. Fred, et al. *Function Analysis and Function Reallocation. KC-135 Crew Reduction Feasibility Demonstration Simulation Study, Volume 1: Function Analysis and Function Reallocation*. Crew Station Evaluation Facility, Human Factors Branch, ASD/ENECH, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH, June 1991. (ASD-TR-91-5005)

Appendix A. Value Model

A.1 Descriptions of the Attributes

The attribute scales were assumed to be linear. A zero level and a one level were specified. The attribute was then scored between those points.

1. DEVELOP ROUTE OF FLIGHT
 - 0 >4 hours required and all work done manually
 - 1 < 30 minutes required and all work computerized
2. DEVELOP FLIGHT PLAN
 - 0 >4 hours required and all work done manually
 - 1 < 30 minutes required and all work computerized
3. COORDINATING COMMUNICATIONS AND INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS
 - 0 No crewmember except pilots available to accomplish
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
4. DRAWING CHART TO COVER ROUTE OF FLIGHT
 - 0 Chart drawn completely manually by pilots
 - 1 Chart drawn automatically by computer
5. DETERMINE IF SCHEDULE CHANGES HAVE AFFECTED MISSION
 - 0 No crewmember except pilots available to accomplish
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
6. DETERMINE IMPACT OF WEATHER ON MISSION
 - 0 Weather impact not considered
 - 1 Computer automatically overlays weather on intended route of flight
7. DETERMINE IF NOTAMS AFFECT MISSION
 - 0 No crewmember except pilots available to accomplish
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
8. OBTAIN TIME HACK (SYNCHRONIZE WATCHES WITH OFFICIAL TIME)
 - 0 No crewmember except pilots available to accomplish
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
9. DETERMINE IF RECEIVER STATUS WILL CHANGE PLANNED MISSION
 - 0 No crewmember except pilots available to accomplish
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
10. PICK UP FLIGHT INFORMATION PUBLICATION (FLIP) DOCUMENTS
 - 0 No crewmember except pilots available to accomplish
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
11. PREFLIGHT EQUIPMENT
 - 0 > 1 hour required to preflight navigation equipment
 - 1 < 15 minutes required to preflight navigation equipment
12. LOAD MISSION DATA
 - 0 >15 minutes required
 - 1 < 5 minutes required
13. DISTRIBUTE FLIP DOCUMENTS TO CREWMEMBERS
 - 0 No one distributes
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
14. DETERMINE IF RECEIVER STATUS WILL CHANGE TAKEOFF TIME OR MISSION
 - 0 Receiver status never updated
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish

15. PLAN ALTERNATE MISSION IF REQUIRED (MAINTENANCE, RECEIVER REQUEST)
 - 0 No one accomplishes
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
16. RECEIVE ARTCC CLEARANCE
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to receive clearance
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
17. ASSIS BOOM OPERATOR WITH LOADING CARGO
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
18. DIRECT AIRCRAFT INTO AND MAINTAIN FORMATION POSITION
 - 0 No specialized equipment or crewmember available to accomplish
 - 1 Designated crewmember with specialized equipment available to accomplish
19. MONITOR/DIRECT DEPARTURE AFTER TAKEOFF
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish and no visual display
 - 1 Equipment displays departure and shows deviations
20. CHECK HEADING, ALTITUDE, AND AIRSPEED
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish and no equipment monitors deviations
 - 1 Equipment or crewmember monitors continuously
21. MAINTAIN TERRAIN CLEARANCE
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish and no equipment monitors deviations
 - 1 Equipment monitors continuously and warns crew verbally
22. MAINTAIN CLEARANCE FROM HAZARDOUS WEATHER
 - 0 No equipment available to accomplish
 - 1 Equipment monitors continuously
23. SCAN FOR OTHER TRAFFIC DURING TAKEOFF AND DEPARTURE
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish and no equipment monitors other aircraft
 - 1 Equipment monitors continuously and warns of conflicts
24. ENSURE CORRECT FLAP CONFIGURATION SET FOR TAKEOFF
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish and no equipment monitors deviations
 - 1 Equipment monitors continuously
25. ENSURE RADIO COMMUNICATIONS MONITORED
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
26. REQUIRED ALTITUDE CALLS MADE
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
27. PERFORM AIR REFUELING RENDEZVOUS
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish and no specialized equipment
 - 1 Equipment automatically accomplishes
28. MAINTAIN AIRCRAFT WITHIN AIR REFUELING AREA
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish and no visual display
 - 1 Equipment displays area and shows deviations
29. MAINTAIN REQUIRED MISSION TIMING
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish and no specialized equipment
 - 1 Equipment continuously monitors and displays deviations

- 30. MAINTAIN FORMATION POSITION
 - 0 No equipment available to monitor
 - 1 Equipment continuously monitors and displays position
- 31. SET RENDEZVOUS EQUIPMENT
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish and all equipment manual
 - 1 Equipment automatically set
- 32. COMMUNICATE RENDEZVOUS INFORMATION WITH RECEIVER
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
- 33. IDENTIFY RECEIVER RADAR BEACON
 - 0 No ability to receive beacon
 - 1 Equipment automatically displays and identifies beacon
- 34. DETERMINE OVERRUN
 - 0 No ability to determine electronically
 - 1 Equipment automatically determines overrun
- 35. DETERMINE EQUIPMENT STATUS
 - 0 No ability to monitor equipment status
 - 1 Status automatically determined and malfunctions prominently displayed
- 36. UPDATE INERTIAL NAVIGATION SYSTEM
 - 0 No ability to update INS
 - 1 Automatically updated by GPS
- 37. TRACK POSITION WITH RESPECT TO DESIRED COURSE
 - 0 No ability to track position electronically
 - 1 Equipment continuously monitors and displays position with respect to desired course
- 38. DIVERT TO UNPLANNED DESTINATION
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish and no automatic equipment
 - 1 Equipment automatically computes and displays distance, time and heading
- 39. MEET MISSION TIMING
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish and no specialized equipment
 - 1 Equipment continuously monitors and displays deviations
- 40. TROUBLE-SHOOT MALFUNCTIONS
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to manually search technical orders
 - 1 Computerized malfunction information available online
- 41. MONITOR RADIOS
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
- 42. POSITION SWITCHES AND CIRCUIT BREAKERS FOR PILOTS
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
- 43. ASSIST BOOM OPERATOR WITH PASSENGER CONTROL
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
- 44. ENSURE AIRCRAFT ARRIVES AT DESTINATION/FIX
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish and no automatic equipment
 - 1 Equipment automatically computes and displays

- 45. MAINTAIN TERRAIN CLEARANCE
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish and no equipment monitors deviations
 - 1 Equipment monitors continuously and warns crew verbally
- 46. PERFORM AIRBORN RADAR DIRECTED APPROACH
 - 0 No ability to perform
 - 1 Equipment automatically displays approach and shows deviations
- 47. MONITOR POSITION WITH RESPECT TO ENROUTE CHARTS
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to perform and all manual
 - 1 Equipment automatically displays position and can accept identifiers for naviads/intersections
- 48. MONITOR DRIFT AND GROUND SPEED DURING APPROACH
 - 0 No ability to monitor
 - 1 Equipment automatically and continuously displays/warns for windshear
- 49. SCAN FOR TRAFFIC DURING DESCENT AND APPROACH
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish and no equipment monitors other aircraft
 - 1 Equipment monitors continuously and warns of conflicts
- 50. MONITOR WEATHER REPORTS THAT COULD AFFECT APPROACH OR LANDING
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
- 51. WARN PILOT APPROACHING ASSIGNED ALTITUDES OR APPROACH DECISION POINTS
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
- 52. ENSURE ATC CLEARANCE IS RECEIVED FOR DESIRED APPROACH
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
- 53. ENSURE GEAR, FLAPS AND FUEL PANEL CONFIGURED CORRECTLY
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
- 54. MONITOR HEADING, ALTITUDE, AIRSPEED, AND BANK ANGLE
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
- 55. MONITOR RUNWAY REMAINING VERSUS SPEED
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish
- 56. MONITOR APPROACH
 - 0 Pilots only crewmembers available to accomplish
 - 1 Designated crewmember available who doesn't have to interrupt other duties to accomplish

A.2 Survey

This survey will be used for an AFIT thesis to determine the utility of the KC-135 with the navigator as part of the crew. I broke the tanker mission into mission phases with the functions that navs typically accomplish during these phases of flight. This rating will be compared to the KC-135 with upgraded avionics and no navigator. Maj Robert Deivert is the author of this thesis. I was a CCTS flightline instructor at the 93AREFS until May of 1993. If you feel I have overlooked anything navs do, please add your comments at the end of the questionnaire. I know how busy you are and I appreciate the time you spend filling out this survey. For each question divide 100 points among the selections so that the total is 100 points.

1. How much emphasis should be placed on safety of flight versus mission accomplishment? (Give a score to each on so they add to 100. i.e. 60 for safety of flight, 40 for mission accomplishment)

SAFETY OF FLIGHT _____
MISSION ACCOMPLISHMENT _____

2. Rate how much each phase of flight contributes to safety of flight. (once again all the numbers should add to 100)

MISSION PLANNING _____
SQUADRON/BASE OPS _____
PREFLIGHT _____
TAKEOFF AND DEPARTURE _____
AIR REFUELING _____
CRUISE _____
DESCENT AND APPROACH _____

3. Rate how much each phase of flight contributes to overall mission accomplishment.

MISSION PLANNING _____
SQUADRON/BASE OPS _____
PREFLIGHT _____
TAKEOFF AND DEPARTURE _____
AIR REFUELING _____
CRUISE _____
DESCENT AND APPROACH _____

4. How much does each phase of mission planning contribute to safety of flight?

ROUTE OF FLIGHT _____
CHART PREPARATION _____
FLIGHT PLAN PREPARATION _____
COORDINATE COMM AND INTEL _____

5. How much does each phase of mission planning contribute to mission accomplishment?

ROUTE OF FLIGHT _____
CHART PREPARATION _____
FLIGHT PLAN PREPARATION _____
COORDINATE COMM AND INTEL _____

6. How much do squadron/base ops activities contribute to safety of flight?

CHECK FOR SCHEDULE CHANGES _____
CHECK FOR WEATHER IMPACT ON MISSION _____
CHECK NOTAMS _____
TIME HACK _____
CHECK RECEIVER STATUS _____
GET FLIP DOCUMENTS _____

7. How much do squadron/base ops activities contribute to mission accomplishment?

CHECK FOR SCHEDULE CHANGES _____
CHECK FOR WEATHER IMPACT ON MISSION _____
CHECK NOTAMS _____
TIME HACK _____
CHECK RECEIVER STATUS _____
GET FLIP DOCUMENTS _____

8. How much do preflight actions contribute to safety of flight?

PREFLIGHT EQUIPMENT _____
LOAD MISSION DATA _____
DISTRIBUTE FLIP _____
SECURE VOICE _____
RECEIVER STATUS _____
COMPUTE ALTERNATE MISSION TIMING _____
ARTCC CLEARANCE _____
ASSIST WITH CARGO _____

9. How much do preflight actions contribute to mission accomplishment?

PREFLIGHT EQUIPMENT _____
LOAD MISSION DATA _____
DISTRIBUTE FLIP _____
SECURE VOICE _____
RECEIVER STATUS _____
COMPUTE ALTERNATE MISSION TIMING _____
ARTCC CLEARANCE _____
ASSIST WITH CARGO _____

10. How much do takeoff and departure actions contribute to safety of flight?

CROSS-CHECK SPEED BRAKES AND FLAPS _____
MONITOR ARTCC COMMUNICATIONS _____
MONITOR/DIRECT DEPARTURE _____
CHECK HEADING, ALTITUDE, AND AIRSPEED _____
DIRECT FORMATION JOIN UP _____
MONITOR FORMATION POSITION _____
MONITOR TERRAIN CLEARANCE _____
AVOID HAZARDOUS WEATHER _____
MONITOR HF COMMUNICATIONS _____
MAKE ALTITUDE CALLS _____
SCAN FOR TRAFFIC _____

11. How much do takeoff and departure actions contribute to mission accomplishment?

CROSS-CHECK SPEED BRAKES AND FLAPS _____
MONITOR ARTCC COMMUNICATIONS _____
MONITOR/DIRECT DEPARTURE _____
CHECK HEADING, ALTITUDE, AND AIRSPEED _____
DIRECT FORMATION JOIN UP _____
MONITOR FORMATION POSITION _____
MONITOR TERRAIN CLEARANCE _____
AVOID HAZARDOUS WEATHER _____
MONITOR HF COMMUNICATIONS _____
MAKE ALTITUDE CALLS _____
SCAN FOR TRAFFIC _____

12. How much do air refueling actions contribute to safety of flight?

COMPUTE ORBIT INFORMATION _____
SET RENDEZVOUS EQUIPMENT _____
COMMUNICATE WITH RECEIVER _____
MAINTAIN ORBIT _____
RENDEZVOUS CALCULATIONS _____
PERFORM RENDEZVOUS _____
IDENTIFY RECEIVER BEACON _____
MAINTAIN FORMATION POSITION _____
DETERMINE OVERRUN _____
MAINTAIN ANCHOR AREA _____
MAINTAIN MISSION TIMING _____
RECORD AIR REFUELING DATA _____

13. How much do air refueling actions contribute to mission accomplishment?

COMPUTE ORBIT INFORMATION _____
SET RENDEZVOUS EQUIPMENT _____
COMMUNICATE WITH RECEIVER _____
MAINTAIN ORBIT _____
RENDEZVOUS CALCULATIONS _____
PERFORM RENDEZVOUS _____
IDENTIFY RECEIVER BEACON _____
MAINTAIN FORMATION POSITION _____
DETERMINE OVERRUN _____
MAINTAIN ANCHOR AREA _____
MAINTAIN MISSION TIMING _____
RECORD AIR REFUELING DATA _____

14. How much do actions performed during cruise contribute to safety of flight?

MONITOR NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT STATUS _____
UPDATE INS AS REQUIRED _____
TRACK AIRCRAFT POSITION _____
MONITOR ARTCC, UHF, VHF AND HF RADIOS _____
MAINTAIN COURSE CENTERLINE _____
ADJUST COURSE/SPEED TO MEET MISSION TIMING _____
TROUBLE SHOOT DURING MALFUNCTIONS/EMERGENCIES _____
COMMUNICATE WITH ARTCC DURING EMERGENCIES _____
POSITION SWITCHES/CIRCUIT BREAKERS FOR PILOTS _____
ASSIST BOOM OPERATOR WITH PASSENGERS _____
DIRECT PLANE TO NEW DESTINATION DURING DIVERT _____

15. How much do actions performed during cruise contribute to mission accomplishment?

MONITOR NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT STATUS _____
UPDATE INS AS REQUIRED _____
TRACK AIRCRAFT POSITION _____
MONITOR ARTCC, UHF, VHF AND HF RADIOS _____
MAINTAIN COURSE CENTERLINE _____
ADJUST COURSE/SPEED TO MEET MISSION TIMING _____
TROUBLE SHOOT DURING MALFUNCTIONS/EMERGENCIES _____
COMMUNICATE WITH ARTCC DURING EMERGENCIES _____
POSITION SWITCHES/CIRCUIT BREAKERS FOR PILOTS _____
ASSIST BOOM OPERATOR WITH PASSENGERS _____
DIRECT PLANE TO NEW DESTINATION DURING DIVERT _____

16. How much do descent and approach actions contribute to safety of flight?

DIRECT PLANE TO DESTINATION/FIX _____
REVIEW AND MONITOR APPROACHES _____
MAINTAIN TERRAIN CLEARANCE _____
MONITOR WEATHER REPORTS _____
MAKE ALTITUDE CALLS _____
ENSURE PILOTS FLY CLEARED APPROACH _____
ANNOUNCE APPROACH DECISION POINT _____
PERFORM RADAR DIRECTED APPROACH _____
MONITOR POSITION WITH RESPECT TO ENROUTE CHARTS _____
MONITOR WINDSHEAR(GROUNDSPEED DURING APPROACH) _____
RELAY DRIFT AND GROUNDSPEED INFORMATION _____
ENSURE GEAR, FLAPS, AND FUEL PANEL SET CORRECTLY _____
SCAN FOR TRAFFIC _____
ENSURE MISSED APPROACH PROCEDURES FOLLOWED _____
MONITOR ALTITUDE, HEADING, AND AIRSPEED _____
MONITOR BANK ANGLE _____
MONITOR LANDING ROLLOUT AND RUNWAY REMAINING _____

17. How much do descent and approach actions contribute to mission accomplishment?

DIRECT PLANE TO DESTINATION/FIX _____
REVIEW AND MONITOR APPROACHES _____
MAINTAIN TERRAIN CLEARANCE _____
MONITOR WEATHER REPORTS _____
MAKE ALTITUDE CALLS _____
ENSURE PILOTS FLY CLEARED APPROACH _____
ANNOUNCE APPROACH DECISION POINT _____
PERFORM RADAR DIRECTED APPROACH _____
MONITOR POSITION WITH RESPECT TO ENROUTE CHARTS _____
MONITOR WINDSHEAR(GROUNDSPEED DURING APPROACH) _____
RELAY DRIFT AND GROUNDSPEED INFORMATION _____
ENSURE GEAR, FLAPS, AND FUEL PANEL SET CORRECTLY _____
SCAN FOR TRAFFIC _____
ENSURE MISSED APPROACH PROCEDURES FOLLOWED _____
MONITOR ALTITUDE, HEADING, AND AIRSPEED _____
MONITOR BANK ANGLE _____
MONITOR LANDING ROLLOUT AND RUNWAY REMAINING _____

COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS:

A.3 Scored Value Model

UTILITY WITH NAVIGATOR										
FUNDAMENTAL OBJECTIVE	MISSION PHASE	ATTRIBUTE NUMBER	ATTRIBUTES	WEIGHT	SCORE	ATTRIBUTE (WT) * (SCORE)	MEANS OBJ (WT) * (SUM)	MANUAL		
	MISSION PLANNING 0.24	1	ROUTE OF FLIGHT	0.34	0.4	0.136				
		2	FLIGHT PLAN	0.27	0.5	0.135				
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED								
		3	COORDINATE MISSION COMM AND INTEL REQUIREMENTS	0.16	0.5	0.08				
		4	CHART	0.24	0.3	0.072				
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED					0.423	0.10152	0.03648	
		5	CHECK FOR SCHEDULE CHANGES	0.16	0.5	0.08				
		SQUADRON/ BASE OPS 0.07	6	CHECK WEATHER IMPACT ON MISSION	0.34	0.3	0.102			
			7	CHECK NOTAMS	0.21	0.5	0.105			
			8	TIME HACK	0.06	0.5	0.03			
9	RECEIVER STATUS		0.09	0.5	0.045					
	SAFETY OF FLIGHT 0.7	10	FLIP DOCUMENTS	0.15	0.5	0.075				
		PREFLIGHT 0.09	11	PREFLIGHT EQUIPMENT	0.36	0.8	0.288			
			12	LOAD MISSION DATA	0.15	0.8	0.12			
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED					0.437	0.03059	0.03059
			13	DISTRIBUTE FLIP	0.08	0.5	0.045			
			14	RECEIVER STATUS	0.06	0.5	0.03			
			15	COMPUTE ALTERNATE MISSION TIMING	0.13	0.5	0.065			
			16	ARTCC CLEARANCE	0.15	0.5	0.075			
		17	ASSIST WITH CARGO	0.07	0.5	0.035				
			TAKEOFF AND DEPARTURE 0.18	MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED					0.658	0.05922
18	FORMATION			0.21	0.8	0.168				
19	MONITOR/DIRECT DEPARTURE			0.07	0.5	0.035				
20	CHECK HEADING, ALTITUDE, AIRSPEED			0.11	0.5	0.055				
21	MAINTAIN TERRAIN CLEARANCE			0.09	0.7	0.063				
22	AVOID HAZARDOUS WEATHER			0.14	0.8	0.112				
23	SCAN FOR TRAFFIC			0.06	0.3	0.018				
MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED										
24	FLAP CONFIGURATION			0.1	0.8	0.08				
25	MONITOR RADIO COMMUNICATIONS			0.14	0.5	0.07				
	AIR REFUELING 0.14	26	MAKE ALTITUDE CALLS	0.08	0.5	0.04				
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED					0.841	0.11538	0.0342	
		27	PERFORM RENDEZVOUS	0.27	0.5	0.135				
		28	MAINTAIN REFUELING AREA	0.18	0.5	0.09				
		29	MAINTAIN MISSION TIMING	0.06	0.5	0.03				
		30	FORMATION POSITION	0.11	0.8	0.088				
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED								
		31	SET RENDEZVOUS EQUIPMENT	0.07	0.5	0.035				
		32	COMMUNICATE WITH RECEIVER	0.17	0.5	0.085				
		33	IDENTIFY RECEIVER BEACON	0.05	0.8	0.04				
	CRUISE 0.07	34	DETERMINE OVERRUN	0.09	0.5	0.045				
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED					0.548	0.07672	0.0287	
		35	DETERMINE EQUIPMENT STATUS	0.1	0.5	0.05				
		36	UPDATE INS	0.1	0.4	0.04				
		37	TRACK AIRCRAFT POSITION	0.19	0.7	0.133				
		38	DIVERT TO UNPLANNED DESTINATION	0.12	0.7	0.084				
		39	MEET MISSION TIMING	0.06	0.5	0.03				
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED								
		40	TROUBLE SHOOT MALFUNCTIONS	0.12	0.6	0.072				
		41	MONITOR RADIOS	0.2	0.5	0.1				
	DESCENT AND APPROACH 0.2	42	POSITION SWITCHES/CIRCUIT BREAKERS FOR PILOTS	0.06	0.5	0.03				
		43	ASSIST BOOM OPERATOR WITH PASSENGERS	0.05	0.5	0.025				
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED					0.564	0.03948	0.01589	
		44	DIRECT PLANE TO DESTINATION FIX	0.06	0.7	0.042				
		45	MAINTAIN TERRAIN CLEARANCE	0.1	0.5	0.05				
		46	PERFORM ARDA	0.03	0.5	0.015				
		47	MONITOR POSITION WITH RESPECT TO ENROUTE CHARTS	0.03	0.5	0.015				
		48	MONITOR DRIFT AND GROUND SPEED	0.14	0.5	0.07				
		49	SCAN FOR TRAFFIC	0.05	0.3	0.015				
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED								
		50	MONITOR WEATHER REPORTS	0.06	0.5	0.03				
		51	MAKE ALTITUDE CALLS	0.11	0.8	0.088				
		52	ENSURE ATC CLEARS DESIRED APPROACH	0.06	0.5	0.03				
		53	ENSURE CORRECT GEAR, FLAPS, FUEL PANEL CONFIG.	0.06	0.5	0.045				
		54	MONITOR HEADING, ALTITUDE, AIRSPEED, AND BANK ANGLE	0.12	0.5	0.06				
		55	MONITOR LANDING ROLLOUT	0.03	0.8	0.024				
		56	MONITOR APPROACH	0.14	0.7	0.098				
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED					0.582	0.1164	0.075	
		MEANS OBJ SUM						0.53931	0.24336	
		SAFETY OF FLIGHT UTILITY							0.377517	
MISSION ACCOMP. UTILITY							0.158214			
TOTAL VALUE							0.535731			

UTILITY WITH NAVIGATOR									
FUNDAMENTAL OBJECTIVE	MISSION PHASE	ATTRIBUTE NUMBER	ATTRIBUTES	WEIGHT	SCORE	ATTRIBUTE (WT) * (SCORE)	MEANS OBJ (WT) * (SUM)	MANUAL	
MISSION ACCOMPLISHMENT 0.3	MISSION PLANNING 0.27	1	ROUTE OF FLIGHT	0.31	0.4	0.124			
		2	FLIGHT PLAN	0.29	0.5	0.145			
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED							
		3	COORDINATE MISSION COMM AND INTEL REQUIREMENTS	0.16	0.5	0.08			
	4	CHART	0.23	0.3	0.069	0.418	0.11286	0.04023	
	MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED								
	SQUADRON/ BASE OPS 0.07	5	CHECK FOR SCHEDULE CHANGES	0.25	0.5	0.125			
		6	CHECK WEATHER IMPACT ON MISSION	0.31	0.3	0.093			
		7	CHECK NOTAMS	0.1	0.5	0.05			
		8	TIME HACK	0.07	0.5	0.035			
		9	RECEIVER STATUS	0.15	0.5	0.075			
		10	FLIP DOCUMENTS	0.13	0.5	0.065	0.443	0.03101	0.03101
	PREFLIGHT 0.09	11	PREFLIGHT EQUIPMENT	0.31	0.8	0.248			
		12	LOAD MISSION DATA	0.19	0.8	0.152			
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED							
		13	DISTRIBUTE FLIP	0.15	0.5	0.075			
		14	RECEIVER STATUS	0.13	0.5	0.065			
		15	COMPUTE ALTERNATE MISSION TIMING	0.14	0.5	0.07			
		16	ARTCC CLEARANCE	0.11	0.5	0.055			
		17	ASSIST WITH CARGO	0.06	0.5	0.03	0.695	0.06255	0.02655
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED							
		TAKEOFF AND DEPARTURE 0.12	18	FORMATION	0.24	0.8	0.192		
			19	MONITOR/DIRECT DEPARTURE	0.09	0.5	0.045		
			20	CHECK HEADING, ALTITUDE, AIRSPEED	0.1	0.5	0.05		
			21	MAINTAIN TERRAIN CLEARANCE	0.09	0.7	0.063		
	22		AVOID HAZARDOUS WEATHER	0.14	0.8	0.112			
	23		SCAN FOR TRAFFIC	0.06	0.3	0.018			
AIR REFUELING 0.25	MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED								
	24	FLAP CONFIGURATION	0.06	0.8	0.048				
	25	MONITOR RADIO COMMUNICATIONS	0.17	0.5	0.085				
	26	MAKE ALTITUDE CALLS	0.06	0.5	0.03	0.643	0.07716	0.01956	
	27	PERFORM RENDEZVOUS	0.33	0.5	0.165				
	28	MAINTAIN REFUELING AREA	0.17	0.5	0.085				
	29	MAINTAIN MISSION TIMING	0.09	0.5	0.045				
	30	FORMATION POSITION	0.08	0.8	0.072				
	MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED								
	31	SET RENDEZVOUS EQUIPMENT	0.08	0.5	0.04				
	32	COMMUNICATE WITH RECEIVER	0.12	0.5	0.06				
CRUISE 0.08	33	IDENTIFY RECEIVER BEACON	0.05	0.8	0.04				
	34	DETERMINE OVERRUN	0.06	0.5	0.03	0.537	0.13425	0.0425	
	35	DETERMINE EQUIPMENT STATUS	0.11	0.5	0.055				
	36	UPDATE INS	0.1	0.4	0.04				
	37	TRACK AIRCRAFT POSITION	0.2	0.7	0.14				
	38	DIVERT TO UNPLANNED DESTINATION	0.1	0.7	0.07				
	39	MEET MISSION TIMING	0.13	0.5	0.065				
	MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED								
	40	TROUBLE SHOOT MALFUNCTIONS	0.09	0.8	0.072				
	41	MONITOR RADIOS	0.16	0.5	0.08				
DESCENT AND APPROACH 0.11	42	POSITION SWITCHES/CIRCUIT BREAKERS FOR PILOTS	0.05	0.5	0.025				
	43	ASSIST BOOM OPERATOR WITH PASSENGERS	0.05	0.5	0.025	0.554	0.04432	0.01472	
	44	DIRECT PLANE TO DESTINATION FIX	0.08	0.7	0.056				
	45	MAINTAIN TERRAIN CLEARANCE	0.04	0.5	0.02				
	46	PERFORM ARDA	0.05	0.5	0.025				
	47	MONITOR POSITION WITH RESPECT TO ENROUTE CHARTS	0.1	0.5	0.05				
	48	MONITOR DRIFT AND GROUND SPEED	0.11	0.5	0.05				
	49	SCAN FOR TRAFFIC	0.04	0.3	0.012				
	MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED								
	50	MONITOR WEATHER REPORTS	0.06	0.5	0.03				
	51	MAKE ALTITUDE CALLS	0.13	0.8	0.104				
	52	ENSURE ATC CLEARS DESIRED APPROACH	0.09	0.5	0.04				
	53	ENSURE CORRECT GEAR, FLAPS, FUEL PANEL CONFIG.	0.06	0.5	0.03				
	54	MONITOR HEADING, ALTITUDE, AIRSPEED, AND BANK ANGLE	0.08	0.5	0.04				
	55	MONITOR LANDING ROLLOUT	0.03	0.8	0.024				
56	MONITOR APPROACH	0.16	0.7	0.112	0.593	0.08523	0.0418		
						MEANS OBJ. SUM	0.52738	0.21837	
						MISSION ACCOMP.			
						UTILITY	0.158214		

UTILITY WITH UPGRADED EQUIPMENT								
FUNDAMENTAL OBJECTIVE	MISSION PHASE	ATTRIBUTE NUMBER	ATTRIBUTES	WEIGHT	SCORE	ATTRIBUTE (WT) * (SCORE)	MEANS OBJ (WT) * (SUM)	MANUAL
	MISSION PLANNING 0.24	1	ROUTE OF FLIGHT	0.34	0.8	0.272		
		2	FLIGHT PLAN	0.27	0.8	0.216		
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED					
		3	COORDINATE MISSION COMM AND INTEL REQUIREMENTS	0.16	0.375	0.06		
		4	CHART	0.24	0.225	0.054		
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED			0.602	0.14448	0.02738
		5	CHECK FOR SCHEDULE CHANGES	0.16	0.375	0.06		
		6	CHECK WEATHER IMPACT ON MISSION	0.34	0.225	0.0785		
		7	CHECK NOTAMS	0.21	0.375	0.07875		
		8	TIME HACK	0.06	0.375	0.0225		
	SAFETY OF FLIGHT 0.7	9	RECEIVER STATUS	0.09	0.375	0.03375		
		10	FLIP DOCUMENTS	0.15	0.375	0.05625		
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED			0.32775	0.0228425	0.022943
		11	PREFLIGHT EQUIPMENT	0.36	0.4	0.144		
		12	LOAD MISSION DATA	0.15	0.9	0.135		
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED					
		13	DISTRIBUTE FLIP	0.09	0.375	0.03375		
		14	RECEIVER STATUS	0.06	0.375	0.0225		
		15	COMPUTE ALTERNATE MISSION TIMING	0.13	0.375	0.04875		
		16	ARTCC CLEARANCE	0.15	0.375	0.05625		
	TAKEOFF AND DEPARTURE 0.18	17	ASSIST WITH CARGO	0.07	0.375	0.02625		
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED			0.4865	0.041985	0.016875
		18	FORMATION	0.21	0.3	0.063		
		19	MONITOR/DIRECT DEPARTURE	0.07	0.7	0.049		
		20	CHECK HEADING, ALTITUDE, AIRSPEED	0.11	0.3	0.033		
		21	MAINTAIN TERRAIN CLEARANCE	0.09	0.1	0.009		
		22	AVOID HAZARDOUS WEATHER	0.14	0.8	0.112		
		23	SCAN FOR TRAFFIC	0.06	0.2	0.012		
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED					
		24	FLAP CONFIGURATION	0.1	0.6	0.06		
	AIR REFUELING 0.14	25	MONITOR RADIO COMMUNICATIONS	0.14	0.375	0.0525		
		26	MAKE ALTITUDE CALLS	0.08	0.375	0.03		
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED			0.4205	0.07589	0.02585
		27	PERFORM RENDEZVOUS	0.27	0.9	0.243		
		28	MAINTAIN REFUELING AREA	0.18	0.8	0.144		
		29	MAINTAIN MISSION TIMING	0.06	0.7	0.042		
		30	FORMATION POSITION	0.11	0.3	0.033		
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED					
		31	SET RENDEZVOUS EQUIPMENT	0.07	0.375	0.02625		
		32	COMMUNICATE WITH RECEIVER	0.17	0.375	0.06375		
	CRUISE 0.07	33	IDENTIFY RECEIVER BEACON	0.05	0	0		
		34	DETERMINE OVERRUN	0.09	0.375	0.03375		
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED			0.58575	0.082005	0.017325
		35	DETERMINE EQUIPMENT STATUS	0.1	0.4	0.04		
		36	UPDATE INS	0.1	1	0.1		
		37	TRACK AIRCRAFT POSITION	0.19	0.9	0.171		
		38	DIVERT TO UNPLANNED DESTINATION	0.12	0.9	0.108		
		39	MEET MISSION TIMING	0.06	0.7	0.042		
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED					
		40	TROUBLE SHOOT MALFUNCTIONS	0.12	0.45	0.054		
	DESCENT AND APPROACH 0.2	41	MONITOR RADIOS	0.2	0.375	0.075		
		42	POSITION SWITCHES/CIRCUIT BREAKERS FOR PILOTS	0.06	0.375	0.0225		
		43	ASSIST BOOM OPERATOR WITH PASSENGERS	0.05	0.375	0.01875		
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED			0.63125	0.0441875	0.011818
		44	DIRECT PLANE TO DESTINATION FIX	0.06	0.9	0.054		
		45	MAINTAIN TERRAIN CLEARANCE	0.1	0.3	0.03		
		46	PERFORM AROA	0.03	0	0		
		47	MONITOR POSITION WITH RESPECT TO ENROUTE CHARTS	0.03	0.8	0.018		
		48	MONITOR DRIFT AND GROUND SPEED	0.14	0.4	0.056		
		49	SCAN FOR TRAFFIC	0.05	0.2	0.01		
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED					
		50	MONITOR WEATHER REPORTS	0.06	0.375	0.0225		
		51	MAKE ALTITUDE CALLS	0.11	0.8	0.088		
		52	ENSURE ATC CLEARS DESIRED APPROACH	0.06	0.375	0.0225		
		53	ENSURE CORRECT GEAR, FLAPS, FUEL PANEL CONFIG.	0.09	0.375	0.03375		
		54	MONITOR HEADING, ALTITUDE, AIRSPEED, AND BANK ANGLE	0.12	0.375	0.045		
		55	MONITOR LANDING ROLLOUT	0.03	0.8	0.018		
		56	MONITOR APPROACH	0.14	0.525	0.0735		
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED			0.44825	0.08895	0.05625
			MEANS OBJ SUM				0.50114	0.17832
			SAFETY OF FLIGHT UTILITY				0.350798	
			MISSION ACCOMP.				0.18168725	
			TOTAL UTILITY				0.51248525	
			VALUE					

		UTILITY WITH UPGRADED EQUIPMENT		WEIGHT	SCORE	ATTRIBUTE	MEANS OBJ		
FUNDAMENTAL	MISSION	ATTRIBUTE	ATTRIBUTES			(WT) * (SCORE)	(WT) * (SUM)	MANUAL	
OBJECTIVE	PHASE	NUMBER							
	MISSION	1	ROUTE OF FLIGHT	0.31	0.8	0.248			
	PLANNING	2	FLIGHT PLAN	0.29	0.8	0.232			
	0.27		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED						
		3	COORDINATE MISSION COMM AND INTEL REQUIREMENTS	0.18	0.375	0.08			
		4	CHART	0.23	0.225	0.05175	0.1587725	0.03017	
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED						
	SQUADRON/ BASE OPS	5	CHECK FOR SCHEDULE CHANGES	0.25	0.375	0.09375			
	0.07	6	CHECK WEATHER IMPACT ON MISSION	0.31	0.225	0.06875			
		7	CHECK NOTAMS	0.1	0.375	0.0375			
		8	TIME HACK	0.07	0.375	0.02625			
		9	RECEIVER STATUS	0.15	0.375	0.05625			
		10	FLIP DOCUMENTS	0.13	0.375	0.04875			
	MISSION					0.33225	0.0232575	0.02326	
	ACCOMPLISHMENT	11	PREFLIGHT EQUIPMENT	0.31	0.4	0.124			
	0.3	0.09	12	LOAD MISSION DATA	0.19	0.8	0.171		
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED						
		13	DISTRIBUTE FLIP	0.15	0.375	0.05625			
		14	RECEIVER STATUS	0.13	0.375	0.04875			
		15	COMPUTE ALTERNATE MISSION TIMING	0.14	0.375	0.0525			
		16	ARTCC CLEARANCE	0.11	0.375	0.04125			
		17	ASSIST WITH CARGO	0.06	0.375	0.0225			
						0.51625	0.0464825	0.01991	
	TAKEOFF	18	FORMATION	0.24	0.3	0.072			
	AND	19	MONITOR/DIRECT DEPARTURE	0.09	0.7	0.063			
	DEPARTURE	20	CHECK HEADING, ALTITUDE, AIRSPEED	0.1	0.3	0.03			
	0.12	21	MAINTAIN TERRAIN CLEARANCE	0.09	0.1	0.009			
		22	AVOID HAZARDOUS WEATHER	0.14	0.8	0.112			
		23	SCAN FOR TRAFFIC	0.06	0.2	0.012			
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED						
		24	FLAP CONFIGURATION	0.06	0.8	0.038			
		25	MONITOR RADIO COMMUNICATIONS	0.17	0.375	0.06375			
		26	MAKE ALTITUDE CALLS	0.06	0.375	0.0225			
						0.42025	0.05043	0.01487	
	AIR	27	PERFORM RENDEZVOUS	0.33	0.9	0.297			
	REFUELING	28	MAINTAIN REFUELING AREA	0.17	0.8	0.138			
	0.25	29	MAINTAIN MISSION TIMING	0.09	0.7	0.063			
		30	FORMATION POSITION	0.09	0.3	0.027			
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED						
		31	SET RENDEZVOUS EQUIPMENT	0.08	0.375	0.03			
		32	COMMUNICATE WITH RECEIVER	0.12	0.375	0.045			
		33	IDENTIFY RECEIVER BEACON	0.05	0	0			
		34	DETERMINE OVERRUN	0.06	0.375	0.0225			
						0.8205	0.155125	0.02438	
	CRUISE	35	DETERMINE EQUIPMENT STATUS	0.11	0.4	0.044			
	0.08	36	UPDATE INS	0.1	1	0.1			
		37	TRACK AIRCRAFT POSITION	0.2	0.9	0.18			
		38	DIVERT TO UNPLANNED DESTINATION	0.1	0.9	0.09			
		39	MEET MISSION TIMING	0.13	0.7	0.091			
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED						
		40	TROUBLE SHOOT MALFUNCTIONS	0.09	0.45	0.0405			
		41	MONITOR RADIOS	0.18	0.375	0.068			
		42	POSITION SWITCH/ESCIRCUIT BREAKERS FOR PILOTS	0.05	0.375	0.01875			
		43	ASSIST BOOM OPERATOR WITH PASSENGERS	0.05	0.375	0.01875			
						0.843	0.05144	0.01104	
		44	DIRECT PLANE TO DESTINATION FIX	0.08	0.9	0.072			
		45	MAINTAIN TERRAIN CLEARANCE	0.04	0.3	0.012			
		46	PERFORM ARDA	0.05	0	0			
		47	MONITOR POSITION WITH RESPECT TO ENROUTE CHARTS	0.1	0.8	0.08			
		48	MONITOR DRIFT AND GROUND SPEED	0.1	0.4	0.04			
		49	SCAN FOR TRAFFIC	0.04	0.2	0.008			
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED						
		50	MONITOR WEATHER REPORTS	0.06	0.375	0.0225			
		51	MAKE ALTITUDE CALLS	0.13	0.8	0.078			
		52	ENSURE ATC CLEARS DESIRED APPROACH	0.08	0.375	0.03			
		53	ENSURE CORRECT GEAR, FLAPS, FUEL PANEL, CONFIG.	0.06	0.375	0.0225			
		54	MONITOR HEADING, ALTITUDE, AIRSPEED, AND BANK ANGLE	0.08	0.375	0.03			
		55	MONITOR LANDING ROLLOUT	0.03	0.8	0.018			
		56	MONITOR APPROACH	0.16	0.525	0.084			
						0.477	0.05247	0.03135	
						MEANS OBJ. SUM	0.5389575	0.15478	
					MISSION ACCOMP.				
					UTILITY	0.18188725			

Appendix B. Costs

B.1 Navigator Costs

YEAR	COMMISSIONING COSTS	SUNT	KC-135 IQT	ACQUIRE 64 NAVS/YR 64*(A+B+C)	COMPOSITE SALARY	NAVIGATOR COMPOSITE SALARIES (254*E)	YEARLY CASH FLOW (F+ D)
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1995	\$78,943	\$124,946	\$131,631	\$21,473,307	\$71,554	\$18,174,716	\$39,648,023
1996	\$81,391	\$128,820	\$135,711	\$22,138,980	\$73,772	\$18,738,132	\$40,877,112
1997	\$83,914	\$132,813	\$139,918	\$22,825,288	\$76,059	\$19,319,014	\$42,144,302
1998	\$86,515	\$136,930	\$144,256	\$23,532,872	\$78,417	\$19,917,904	\$43,450,776
1999	\$89,197	\$141,175	\$148,728	\$24,262,391	\$80,848	\$20,535,359	\$44,797,750
2000	\$91,962	\$145,552	\$153,338	\$25,014,525	\$83,354	\$21,171,955	\$46,186,480
2001	\$94,813	\$150,064	\$158,092	\$25,789,975	\$85,938	\$21,828,285	\$47,618,261
2002	\$97,657	\$154,566	\$162,834	\$26,563,675	\$88,516	\$22,483,134	\$49,046,809
2003	\$100,587	\$159,203	\$167,720	\$27,360,585	\$91,172	\$23,157,628	\$50,518,213
2004	\$103,605	\$163,979	\$172,751	\$28,181,402	\$93,907	\$23,852,357	\$52,033,759
2005	\$106,713	\$168,898	\$177,934	\$29,026,845	\$96,724	\$24,567,928	\$53,594,772
2006	\$109,914	\$173,965	\$183,272	\$29,897,650	\$99,626	\$25,304,965	\$55,202,615
2007	\$113,212	\$179,184	\$188,770	\$30,794,579	\$102,615	\$26,064,114	\$56,858,694
2008	\$116,608	\$184,559	\$194,433	\$31,718,417	\$105,693	\$26,846,038	\$58,564,455
2009	\$120,106	\$190,096	\$200,266	\$32,669,969	\$108,864	\$27,651,419	\$60,321,388
2010	\$123,709	\$195,799	\$206,274	\$33,650,068	\$112,130	\$28,480,962	\$62,131,030
2011	\$127,421	\$201,673	\$212,462	\$34,659,570	\$115,494	\$29,335,390	\$63,994,961
2012	\$131,243	\$207,723	\$218,836	\$35,699,358	\$118,958	\$30,215,452	\$65,914,810
2013	\$135,181	\$213,955	\$225,401	\$36,770,338	\$122,527	\$31,121,916	\$67,892,254
2014	\$139,236	\$220,374	\$232,163	\$37,873,448	\$126,203	\$32,055,573	\$69,929,022
2015	\$143,413	\$226,985	\$239,128	\$39,009,652	\$129,989	\$33,017,240	\$72,026,892
2016	\$147,715	\$233,794	\$246,302	\$40,179,941	\$133,889	\$34,007,758	\$74,187,699
2017	\$152,147	\$240,808	\$253,691	\$41,385,340	\$137,905	\$35,027,990	\$76,413,330
2018	\$156,711	\$248,032	\$261,302	\$42,626,900	\$142,043	\$36,078,830	\$78,705,730
2019	\$161,413	\$255,473	\$269,141	\$43,905,707	\$146,304	\$37,161,195	\$81,066,902
2020	\$166,255	\$263,138	\$277,215	\$45,222,878	\$150,693	\$38,276,031	\$83,498,909

B.2 Equipment Costs

YEAR	NAVIGATOR COMPOSITE SALARY	NUMBER OF NAVS	TOTAL COMPOSITE SALARIES (A * B)	ACQUIRE 10 NAVS/YR	EQUIPMENT CASH FLOW	YEARLY CASH FLOW (C + D + E)
	A	B	C	D	E	F
1995	\$71,554	254	\$18,174,716	\$3,355,204	\$41,300,000	\$62,829,920
1996	\$73,772	254	\$18,738,132	\$3,459,216	\$65,571,600	\$87,768,948
1997	\$76,059	203	\$15,440,000	\$3,566,451	\$96,835,747	\$115,842,198
1998	\$78,417	152	\$11,919,375	\$3,677,011	\$94,577,274	\$110,173,661
1999	\$80,848	102	\$8,246,483	\$3,790,999	\$85,984,331	\$98,021,813
2000	\$83,354	51	\$4,251,062	\$3,908,520	\$73,040,017	\$81,199,599
2001	\$85,938	42	\$3,609,402	\$4,029,684	\$13,451,478	\$21,090,563
2002	\$88,516	42	\$3,717,684	\$4,150,574	\$0	\$7,868,258
2003	\$91,172	42	\$3,829,214	\$4,275,091	\$0	\$8,104,305
2004	\$93,907	42	\$3,944,091	\$4,403,344	\$0	\$8,347,435
2005	\$96,724	42	\$4,062,413	\$4,535,444	\$0	\$8,597,858
2006	\$99,626	42	\$4,184,286	\$4,671,508	\$0	\$8,855,793
2007	\$102,615	42	\$4,309,814	\$4,811,653	\$0	\$9,121,467
2008	\$105,693	42	\$4,439,109	\$4,956,003	\$0	\$9,395,111
2009	\$108,864	42	\$4,572,282	\$5,104,683	\$0	\$9,676,965
2010	\$112,130	42	\$4,709,450	\$5,257,823	\$0	\$9,967,274
2011	\$115,494	42	\$4,850,734	\$5,415,558	\$0	\$10,266,292
2012	\$118,958	42	\$4,996,256	\$5,578,025	\$0	\$10,574,280
2013	\$122,527	42	\$5,146,144	\$5,745,365	\$0	\$10,891,509
2014	\$126,203	42	\$5,300,528	\$5,917,726	\$0	\$11,218,254
2015	\$129,989	42	\$5,459,544	\$6,095,258	\$0	\$11,554,802
2016	\$133,889	42	\$5,623,330	\$6,278,116	\$0	\$11,901,446
2017	\$137,905	42	\$5,792,030	\$6,466,459	\$0	\$12,258,489
2018	\$142,043	42	\$5,965,791	\$6,660,453	\$0	\$12,626,244
2019	\$146,304	42	\$6,144,765	\$6,860,267	\$0	\$13,005,031
2020	\$150,693	42	\$6,329,107	\$7,066,075	\$0	\$13,395,182

B.3 Break-even and Net Present Value Calculations

YEAR	EQUIPMENT YEARLY TOTAL	EQUIPMENT CUMULATIVE TOTAL	EQUIPMENT NPV IN 1995 \$576,824,401	NAVIGATOR YEARLY TOTAL	NAVIGATOR CUMULATIVE TOTAL	NAVIGATOR NPV IN 1995 \$755,829,690
1995	\$62,829,920	\$62,829,920	\$62,829,920	\$39,648,023	\$39,648,023	\$39,648,023
1996	\$87,768,948	\$150,598,868	\$82,957,418	\$40,877,112	\$80,525,135	\$38,636,212
1997	\$115,842,198	\$266,441,066	\$103,489,301	\$42,144,302	\$122,669,437	\$37,650,221
1998	\$110,173,661	\$376,614,727	\$93,029,519	\$43,450,776	\$166,120,213	\$36,689,393
1999	\$98,021,813	\$474,636,539	\$78,231,212	\$44,797,750	\$210,917,963	\$35,753,086
2000	\$81,199,599	\$555,836,138	\$61,252,743	\$46,186,480	\$257,104,443	\$34,840,672
2001	\$21,090,563	\$576,926,701	\$15,037,449	\$47,618,261	\$304,722,704	\$33,951,544
2002	\$7,868,258	\$584,794,959	\$5,302,478	\$49,046,809	\$353,769,513	\$33,053,015
2003	\$8,104,305	\$592,899,264	\$5,162,148	\$50,518,213	\$404,287,726	\$32,178,266
2004	\$8,347,435	\$601,246,699	\$5,025,532	\$52,033,759	\$456,321,485	\$31,326,667
2005	\$8,597,858	\$609,844,557	\$4,892,531	\$53,594,772	\$509,916,257	\$30,497,606
2006	\$8,855,793	\$618,700,350	\$4,763,050	\$55,202,615	\$565,118,872	\$29,690,486
2007	\$9,121,467	\$627,821,817	\$4,636,996	\$56,858,694	\$621,977,566	\$28,904,727
2008	\$9,395,111	\$637,216,929	\$4,514,277	\$58,564,455	\$680,542,021	\$28,139,762
2009	\$9,676,965	\$646,893,893	\$4,394,807	\$60,321,388	\$740,863,409	\$27,395,043
2010	\$9,967,274	\$656,861,167	\$4,278,498	\$62,131,030	\$802,994,439	\$26,670,032
2011	\$10,266,292	\$667,127,458	\$4,165,268	\$63,994,961	\$866,989,400	\$25,964,209
2012	\$10,574,280	\$677,701,739	\$4,055,034	\$65,914,810	\$932,904,209	\$25,277,065
2013	\$10,891,509	\$688,593,248	\$3,947,717	\$67,892,254	\$1,000,796,463	\$24,608,107
2014	\$11,218,254	\$699,811,502	\$3,843,241	\$69,929,022	\$1,070,725,485	\$23,956,853
2015	\$11,554,802	\$711,366,304	\$3,741,529	\$72,026,892	\$1,142,752,377	\$23,322,834
2016	\$11,901,446	\$723,267,750	\$3,642,510	\$74,187,699	\$1,216,940,076	\$22,705,595
2017	\$12,258,489	\$735,526,239	\$3,546,110	\$76,413,330	\$1,293,353,406	\$22,104,690
2018	\$12,626,244	\$748,152,483	\$3,452,263	\$78,705,730	\$1,372,059,136	\$21,519,689
2019	\$13,005,031	\$761,157,514	\$3,360,898	\$81,066,902	\$1,453,126,037	\$20,950,170
2020	\$13,395,182	\$774,552,696	\$3,271,952	\$83,498,909	\$1,536,624,946	\$20,395,723

	NET PRESENT VALUE IN 1995
NAVIGATORS	\$755,829,690
EQUIPMENT	\$576,824,401
DIFFERENCE	\$179,005,289

Appendix C. Value Model With Additional Equipment

C.1 Increased Utility With Upgraded Equipment, GCAS and TCAS

			UTILITY WITH UPGRADED EQUIPMENT, GCAS AND TCAS			
FUNDAMENTAL OBJECTIVE	MISSION PHASE	ATTRIBUTE NUMBER	ATTRIBUTES	WEIGHT	SCORE	
	MISSION PLANNING 0.24	1	ROUTE OF FLIGHT	0.34	0.8	
		2	FLIGHT PLAN	0.27	0.8	
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED			
		3	COORDINATE MISSION COMM AND INTEL REQUIREMENTS	0.18	0.375	
		4	CHART	0.24	0.225	
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED			
		5	CHECK FOR SCHEDULE CHANGES	0.16	0.375	
		6	CHECK WEATHER IMPACT ON MISSION	0.34	0.225	
		7	CHECK NOTAMS	0.21	0.375	
		8	TIME HACK	0.06	0.375	
	SQUADRON/ BASE OPS 0.07	9	RECEIVER STATUS	0.09	0.375	
		10	FLIP DOCUMENTS	0.15	0.375	
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED			
		11	PREFLIGHT EQUIPMENT	0.36	0.4	
		12	LOAD MISSION DATA	0.15	0.9	
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED			
		13	DISTRIBUTE FLIP	0.09	0.375	
		14	RECEIVER STATUS	0.06	0.375	
		15	COMPUTE ALTERNATE MISSION TIMING	0.13	0.375	
		16	ARTCC CLEARANCE	0.15	0.375	
	SAFETY OF FLIGHT 0.7	17	ASSIST WITH CARGO	0.07	0.375	
			MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED			
		18	FORMATION	0.21	0.8	
		19	MONITOR/DIRECT DEPARTURE	0.07	0.7	
20		CHECK HEADING, ALTITUDE, AIRSPEED	0.11	0.3		
21		MAINTAIN TERRAIN CLEARANCE	0.09	0.9		
22		AVOID HAZARDOUS WEATHER	0.14	0.8		
23		SCAN FOR TRAFFIC	0.06	0.9		
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED				
24		FLAP CONFIGURATION	0.1	0.9		
TAKEOFF AND DEPARTURE 0.18	25	MONITOR RADIO COMMUNICATIONS	0.14	0.375		
	26	MAKE ALTITUDE CALLS	0.08	0.375		
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED				
	27	PERFORM RENDEZVOUS	0.27	0.9		
	28	MAINTAIN REFUELING AREA	0.18	0.8		
	29	MAINTAIN MISSION TIMING	0.08	0.7		
	30	FORMATION POSITION	0.11	0.8		
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED				
	31	SET RENDEZVOUS EQUIPMENT	0.07	0.375		
	32	COMMUNICATE WITH RECEIVER	0.17	0.375		
AIR REFUELING 0.14	33	IDENTIFY RECEIVER BEACON	0.05	0		
	34	DETERMINE OVERRUN	0.09	0.9		
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED				
	35	DETERMINE EQUIPMENT STATUS	0.1	0.4		
	36	UPDATE INS	0.1	1		
	37	TRACK AIRCRAFT POSITION	0.19	0.9		
	38	DIVERT TO UNPLANNED DESTINATION	0.12	0.9		
	39	MEET MISSION TIMING	0.06	0.7		
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED				
	40	TROUBLE SHOOT MALFUNCTIONS	0.12	0.45		
CRUISE 0.07	41	MONITOR RADIOS	0.2	0.375		
	42	POSITION SWITCHES/CIRCUIT BREAKERS FOR PILOTS	0.06	0.375		
	43	ASSIST BOOM OPERATOR WITH PASSENGERS	0.05	0.375		
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED				
	44	DIRECT PLANE TO DESTINATION FIX	0.06	0.9		
	45	MAINTAIN TERRAIN CLEARANCE	0.1	0.9		
	46	PERFORM ARDA	0.03	0		
	47	MONITOR POSITION WITH RESPECT TO ENROUTE CHARTS	0.03	0.6		
	48	MONITOR DRIFT AND GROUND SPEED	0.14	0.9		
	49	SCAN FOR TRAFFIC	0.05	0.9		
DESCENT AND APPROACH 0.2		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED				
	50	MONITOR WEATHER REPORTS	0.06	0.375		
	51	MAKE ALTITUDE CALLS	0.11	0.6		
	52	ENSURE ATC CLEARS DESIRED APPROACH	0.06	0.375		
	53	ENSURE CORRECT GEAR, FLAPS, FUEL PANEL CONFIG.	0.09	0.8		
	54	MONITOR HEADING, ALTITUDE, AIRSPEED, AND BANK ANGLE	0.12	0.375		
	55	MONITOR LANDING ROLLOUT	0.03	0.6		
	56	MONITOR APPROACH	0.14	0.525		
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED				
				SAFETY OF FLIGHT		
				UTILITY	0.4206475	
				MISSION ACCOMP		
				UTILITY	0.18070425	
				TOTAL		
				VALUE	0.60135175	

			UTILITY WITH UPGRADED EQUIPMENT, GCAS AND TCAS				
FUNDAMENTAL OBJECTIVE	MISSION PHASE	ATTRIBUTE NUMBER	ATTRIBUTES	WEIGHT	SCORE		
MISSION ACCOMPLISHMENT 0.3	MISSION PLANNING 0.27	1	ROUTE OF FLIGHT	0.31	0.8		
		2	FLIGHT PLAN	0.29	0.8		
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED					
		3	COORDINATE MISSION COMM AND INTEL REQUIREMENTS	0.16	0.375		
		4	CHART	0.23	0.225		
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED					
		SQUADRON/ BASE OPS 0.07	5	CHECK FOR SCHEDULE CHANGES	0.25	0.375	
			6	CHECK WEATHER IMPACT ON MISSION	0.31	0.225	
			7	CHECK NOTAMS	0.1	0.375	
			8	TIME HACK	0.07	0.375	
	9		RECEIVER STATUS	0.15	0.375		
	10		FLIP DOCUMENTS	0.13	0.375		
	PREFLIGHT 0.09	11	PREFLIGHT EQUIPMENT	0.31	0.4		
		12	LOAD MISSION DATA	0.19	0.9		
		MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED					
		13	DISTRIBUTE FLIP	0.15	0.375		
		14	RECEIVER STATUS	0.13	0.375		
		15	COMPUTE ALTERNATE MISSION TIMING	0.14	0.375		
		16	ARTCC CLEARANCE	0.11	0.375		
		17	ASSIST WITH CARGO	0.06	0.375		
		TAKEOFF AND DEPARTURE 0.12	18	FORMATION	0.24	0.8	
			19	MONITOR/DIRECT DEPARTURE	0.09	0.7	
	20		CHECK HEADING, ALTITUDE, AIRSPEED	0.1	0.3		
	21		MAINTAIN TERRAIN CLEARANCE	0.09	0.9		
	22		AVOID HAZARDOUS WEATHER	0.14	0.8		
	23		SCAN FOR TRAFFIC	0.06	0.9		
	MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED						
	24		FLAP CONFIGURATION	0.06	0.9		
	25		MONITOR RADIO COMMUNICATIONS	0.17	0.375		
	26		MAKE ALTITUDE CALLS	0.06	0.375		
AIR REFUELING 0.25	27	PERFORM RENDEZVOUS	0.33	0.9			
	28	MAINTAIN REFUELING AREA	0.17	0.8			
	29	MAINTAIN MISSION TIMING	0.09	0.7			
	30	FORMATION POSITION	0.09	0.8			
	MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED						
	31	SET RENDEZVOUS EQUIPMENT	0.08	0.375			
	32	COMMUNICATE WITH RECEIVER	0.12	0.375			
	33	IDENTIFY RECEIVER BEACON	0.05	0			
	34	DETERMINE OVERRUN	0.06	0.9			
	CRUISE 0.08	35	DETERMINE EQUIPMENT STATUS	0.11	0.4		
36		UPDATE INS	0.1	1			
37		TRACK AIRCRAFT POSITION	0.2	0.9			
38		DIVERT TO UNPLANNED DESTINATION	0.1	0.9			
39		MEET MISSION TIMING	0.13	0.7			
MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED							
40		TROUBLE SHOOT MALFUNCTIONS	0.09	0.45			
41		MONITOR RADIOS	0.16	0.375			
42		POSITION SWITCHES/CIRCUIT BREAKERS FOR PILOTS	0.05	0.375			
43		ASSIST BOOM OPERATOR WITH PASSENGERS	0.05	0.375			
DESCENT AND APPROACH 0.11	44	DIRECT PLANE TO DESTINATION FIX	0.08	0.9			
	45	MAINTAIN TERRAIN CLEARANCE	0.04	0.9			
	46	PERFORM ARDA	0.05	0			
	47	MONITOR POSITION WITH RESPECT TO ENROUTE CHARTS	0.1	0.6			
	48	MONITOR DRIFT AND GROUND SPEED	0.1	0.9			
	49	SCAN FOR TRAFFIC	0.04	0.9			
	MANUALLY ACCOMPLISHED						
	50	MONITOR WEATHER REPORTS	0.06	0.375			
	51	MAKE ALTITUDE CALLS	0.13	0.6			
	52	ENSURE ATC CLEARS DESIRED APPROACH	0.08	0.375			
	53	ENSURE CORRECT GEAR, FLAPS, FUEL PANEL CONFIG.	0.06	0.8			
	54	MONITOR HEADING, ALTITUDE, AIRSPEED, AND BANK ANGLE	0.08	0.375			
	55	MONITOR LANDING ROLLOUT	0.03	0.6			
	56	MONITOR APPROACH	0.16	0.525			
				MISSION ACCOMP.			
				UTILITY	0.18070425		

Vita

Major Robert A. Deivert was born in 1958 in Hawkinsville, Georgia. His family was transferred to McGuire AFB, New Jersey in 1963 where he remained until he was graduated from Northern Burlington High School in 1976. He graduated from the University of Florida in 1980 with a Bachelor of Science degree in Chemistry and was commissioned as a Distinguished Graduate of Air Force ROTC. He attended Undergraduate Navigator Training at Mather AFB, California where he also married his wife, Sally. He was assigned to Grand Forks AFB, North Dakota where he served as a B-52 navigator, instructor and flight examiner. He was accepted to Undergraduate Pilot Training at Reese AFB, Texas. Major Deivert transferred to Castle AFB, California in 1990 as a KC-135 aircraft commander. He upgraded to instructor pilot and served as a flight commander, assistant operations officer, and chief of training for the 924th Air Refueling Squadron. While still at Castle AFB, he performed as a Combat Crew Training Squadron instructor pilot until he entered the Graduate School of Engineering, Air Force Institute of Technology in 1993.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE December 1994	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE An Analysis of the KC-135 Three-Person Cockpit			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S) Robert A. Deivert, Maj, USAF				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Air Force Institute of Technology, WPAFB, OH 45433-6583			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER AFIT/GSO/ENS/94D-06	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)			10. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words) Abstract In an effort to quantitatively determine the utility of mission effectiveness of the KC-135, this research used value-focused thinking to measure the impact of replacing the KC-135 navigator with upgraded avionics. A Value Model was developed as a hierarchy with fundamental objectives at the highest level and attributes at the lowest level. Weights were assigned to show the contribution each level had to the one above it. The attributes were given a score and an additive model was used to determine utility with and without a navigator. Break-even analysis and net present value calculations were done to show the costs associated with each alternative. This study reveals that the cockpit with the navigator has a higher utility than the cockpit with the upgraded avionics. Value-focused thinking identified additional equipment that would increase the utility of the upgraded avionics. This approach can be used to identify equipment alternatives in the future that add the most utility. This methodology can be used by the Air National Guard to determine whether they should keep navigators as part of the KC-135 crew.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS KC-135 navigator utility, avionics ugrade, cost analysis			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 62	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING SF 298

The Report Documentation Page (RDP) is used in announcing and cataloging reports. It is important that this information be consistent with the rest of the report, particularly the cover and title page. Instructions for filling in each block of the form follow. It is important to *stay within the lines* to meet *optical scanning requirements*.

Block 1. Agency Use Only (Leave blank).

Block 2. Report Date. Full publication date including day, month, and year, if available (e.g. 1 Jan 88). Must cite at least the year.

Block 3. Type of Report and Dates Covered. State whether report is interim, final, etc. If applicable, enter inclusive report dates (e.g. 10 Jun 87 - 30 Jun 88).

Block 4. Title and Subtitle. A title is taken from the part of the report that provides the most meaningful and complete information. When a report is prepared in more than one volume, repeat the primary title, add volume number, and include subtitle for the specific volume. On classified documents enter the title classification in parentheses.

Block 5. Funding Numbers. To include contract and grant numbers; may include program element number(s), project number(s), task number(s), and work unit number(s). Use the following labels:

C - Contract	PR - Project
G - Grant	TA - Task
PE - Program Element	WU - Work Unit Accession No.

Block 6. Author(s). Name(s) of person(s) responsible for writing the report, performing the research, or credited with the content of the report. If editor or compiler, this should follow the name(s).

Block 7. Performing Organization Name(s) and Address(es). Self-explanatory.

Block 8. Performing Organization Report Number. Enter the unique alphanumeric report number(s) assigned by the organization performing the report.

Block 9. Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Name(s) and Address(es). Self-explanatory.

Block 10. Sponsoring/Monitoring Agency Report Number. (If known)

Block 11. Supplementary Notes. Enter information not included elsewhere such as: Prepared in cooperation with...; Trans. of...; To be published in.... When a report is revised, include a statement whether the new report supersedes or supplements the older report.

Block 12a. Distribution/Availability Statement. Denotes public availability or limitations. Cite any availability to the public. Enter additional limitations or special markings in all capitals (e.g. NOFORN, REL, ITAR).

DOD - See DoDD 5230.24, "Distribution Statements on Technical Documents."

DOE - See authorities.

NASA - See Handbook NHB 2200.2.

NTIS - Leave blank.

Block 12b. Distribution Code.

DOD - Leave blank.

DOE - Enter DOE distribution categories from the Standard Distribution for Unclassified Scientific and Technical Reports.

NASA - Leave blank.

NTIS - Leave blank.

Block 13. Abstract. Include a brief (*Maximum 200 words*) factual summary of the most significant information contained in the report.

Block 14. Subject Terms. Keywords or phrases identifying major subjects in the report.

Block 15. Number of Pages. Enter the total number of pages.

Block 16. Price Code. Enter appropriate price code (*NTIS only*).

Blocks 17. - 19. Security Classifications. Self-explanatory. Enter U.S. Security Classification in accordance with U.S. Security Regulations (i.e., UNCLASSIFIED). If form contains classified information, stamp classification on the top and bottom of the page.

Block 20. Limitation of Abstract. This block must be completed to assign a limitation to the abstract. Enter either UL (unlimited) or SAR (same as report). An entry in this block is necessary if the abstract is to be limited. If blank, the abstract is assumed to be unlimited.